

Cohomology of convex cocompact groups and invariant distributions on limit sets

Martin Olbrich*

Abstract

This paper contains a thorough investigation of invariant distributions supported on limit sets of discrete groups acting convex cocompactly on symmetric spaces of negative curvature. It can be considered as a continuation of [21]. Based on this investigation we

- provide proofs of the Hodge theoretic results for the cohomology of real hyperbolic manifolds announced in [54],
- improve the bounds for the critical exponents obtained by Corlette for the quaternionic and the Cayley case,
- compute the L^2 -cohomology for the corresponding locally symmetric spaces,
- prove a version of the Harder-Borel conjecture for real hyperbolic manifolds, and
- compute higher cohomology groups with coefficients in hyperfunctions supported on the limit set.

*Mathematisches Institut, Universität Göttingen, Bunsenstr. 3-5, 37073 Göttingen, GERMANY, E-mail: olbrich@uni-math.gwdg.de

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	The central result	3
1.2	Higher cohomology groups	5
1.3	The structure of the paper and side results	7
2	Hodge theory	11
3	Hyperfunction scattering	16
4	Invariant distributions on the limit set	29
5	Cohomology of real hyperbolic manifolds	48
6	Finite-dimensional G-representations as coefficients	56
7	Applications and related results	69
7.1	Vanishing results	69
7.2	Cohomology with compact support	70
7.3	The Harder-Borel conjecture	74
8	Hyperfunctions on the limit set as coefficients	84
9	L^2-cohomology of Kleinian manifolds	104

1 Introduction

1.1 The central result

The present paper is an outgrowth of our long lasting attempt to prove a conjecture of Patterson [57] concerning a Hodge theory for noncompact hyperbolic manifolds. It is a slightly revised version of my habilitation thesis delivered at the University of Göttingen.

Patterson's conjecture was stated for quotients $Y = \Gamma \backslash X$ of the real hyperbolic space $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ by a convex cocompact discrete group of isometries with the option to generalize to more general geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds. Γ acts by conformal transformations on the sphere $S^{n-1} = \partial X$ which appears as the geodesic boundary of X . Let Λ be the limit set of this action. We consider the space $\Omega_{-\infty}^p(\partial X)$ of complex valued differential p -forms on X with distributional coefficients, i.e., p -currents. The conformal group G acts on it. It fits into the de Rham complex

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega_{-\infty}^0(\partial X) \xrightarrow{d} \Omega_{-\infty}^1(\partial X) \xrightarrow{d} \dots \xrightarrow{d} \Omega_{-\infty}^{n-1}(\partial X) \xrightarrow{\int_{\partial X}} \mathbb{C} \rightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

which we have completed by $\mathbb{C}$ in order to make it acyclic. (1) is a complex of G -representations. In particular, the center $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ of the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G acts on it. Let F be an irreducible finite-dimensional representation of G . Let $(\Omega_{-\infty}^p(\partial X) \otimes F)^{\chi_F} \subset \Omega_{-\infty}^p(\partial X) \otimes F$ be the largest subrepresentation on which $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ acts by the same character χ_F as on F . It turns out (see Proposition 6.1) that $(\Omega_{-\infty}^p(\partial X) \otimes F)^{\chi_F}$ is isomorphic to the space of distribution sections $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(F, p))$ of a homogeneous vector bundle $V(F, p) \rightarrow \partial X$. Thus (1) induces the acyclic complex

$$0 \rightarrow C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(F, 0)) \rightarrow C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(F, 1)) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(F, n-1)) \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0 \quad (2)$$

which appears in the literature under various names like BGG-resolution or Želobenko complex (see e.g. [71], [5], [40]). The G -representations $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(F, p))$, $p = 0, \dots, n-1$, constitute all principal series representations of G with infinitesimal character χ_F . Note that in case of the trivial representation $F = \mathbb{C}$ the complex (2) coincides with (1). By $Z_{F, \Lambda}^p$ we denote the space of such Γ -invariant p -cocycles of (2) which are supported on the limit set Λ . Let $H^*(\Gamma, F)$ be the group cohomology of Γ with coefficients in the Γ -representation F . Patterson conjectured that for all p

$$H^p(\Gamma, F) \cong Z_{F, \Lambda}^{n-p}. \quad (3)$$

$H^p(\Gamma, F)$ is equal to the de Rham cohomology group $H^p(\Omega^*(Y, E_F))$ of the complex of differential forms on Y with values in the flat vector bundle $E_F \rightarrow Y$ induced by the Γ -representation F . On the other hand, one can interpret elements of $Z_{F, \Lambda}^{n-p}$ as a kind of boundary values of the Γ -invariant lifts from Y to X of very special closed and coclosed E_F -valued p -forms (for noncompact Y the space of all closed and coclosed p -forms is infinite-dimensional). Thus (3) could be considered as a version of Hodge theory for the present situation.

We are mainly interested in the case of noncocompact Γ , since for cocompact Γ the validity of (3) is a rather direct consequence of classical Hodge theory. Then the general receipt for

producing closed and coclosed forms on Y or, more generally, eigenforms of the Laplacian Δ is given by the theory of Eisenstein series (see [21] and the references cited therein). Set $\Omega := \partial X \setminus \Lambda$ and $B := \Gamma \setminus \Omega$. B should be considered as the boundary at infinity of Y . Let us for a moment assume that $F = \mathbb{C}$. Then there is a distinguished Eisenstein series $E_s^p(\phi) \in \Omega^p(Y)$, $s \in \mathbb{C}$, $\phi \in \Omega_{-\infty}^{n-p}(B)$, such that $\Delta E_s^p(\phi) = ((p - \frac{n+1}{2})^2 - s^2)E_s^p(\phi)$, $dE_s^p(\phi) = 0$. We are especially interested in the point $s = p - \frac{n+1}{2}$, which corresponds to closed harmonic forms. The possible poles of E_s^p at $s = p - \frac{n+1}{2}$ will prevent us to prove (3) in full generality. Indeed, there are situations, where (3) is not true. Assume that E_s^p has a pole at $s = p - \frac{n+1}{2}$ of order $k > 0$. The boundary value of the leading singular term $E^p(-k, \phi)$ of $E_s^p(\phi)$ at $s = p - \frac{n+1}{2}$ is an $(n-p)$ -current with support on the limit set. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} d\delta \left(\frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=p-\frac{n+1}{2}} (s - (p - \frac{n+1}{2}))^k E_s^p(\phi) \right) \\ = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=p-\frac{n+1}{2}} (s - (p - \frac{n+1}{2}))^k \Delta E_s^p(\phi) \\ = -\frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=p-\frac{n+1}{2}} (s - (p - \frac{n+1}{2}))^{k+1} (s + p - \frac{n+1}{2}) E_s^p(\phi) \\ = -(k+1)(2p - (n+1)) E^p(-k, \phi) . \end{aligned}$$

Thus $E^p(-k, \phi)$ is exact (if $p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$). If in addition $E^p(-k, \phi)$ is coclosed, then the boundary value of $E^p(-k, \phi)$ belongs to $Z_{\mathbb{C}, \Lambda}^{n-p}$. Therefore, (3) could not be true. An example, where such a situation occurs, is discussed at the end of Section 6.

For general F there are Eisenstein series $E_{F,s}^p$ and a special parameter $s = s_{F,p}$ analogous to E_s^p and $s = p - \frac{n+1}{2}$. In order to deal with singularities of the Eisenstein series at $s = s_{F,p}$ we consider certain successive non-split extensions of the homogeneous bundles $V(F, p) =: V^1(F, p)$

$$0 \rightarrow V^{k-1}(F, p) \rightarrow V^k(F, p) \rightarrow V(F, p) \rightarrow 0 .$$

By ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(F, p))$ we denote the space of Γ -invariant distribution sections of $V^k(F, p)$ which are supported on the limit set. Set

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p)) := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(F, p)) .$$

We have $Z_{F, \Lambda}^p \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(F, p)) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))$. The whole principal part of the Laurent expansion of $E_{F,s}^p(\phi)$ at $s = s_{F,p}$ defines via the boundary value map an element of ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))$. By $E_\Lambda^+(F, p) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))$ we denote the space of all these boundary values. In particular, $E_\Lambda^+(F, p) = \{0\}$ if and only if $E_{F,s}^p$ is regular at $s = s_{F,p}$. In the case of cocompact Γ we set $E_\Lambda^+(F, p) := 0$.

Our result can now be formulated as follows (see Proposition 4.12, Theorem 6.3 and Corollary 6.7). It has been announced in [54].

Theorem 1.1 1. *The space ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))$ is finite-dimensional.*

2. For $p = 1, \dots, n-1$, $p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$ there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow E_{\Lambda}^{+}(F, n-p) \rightarrow {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{+}(F, n-p)) \rightarrow H^p(\Gamma, F) \rightarrow 0. \quad (4)$$

For $p = \frac{n+1}{2}$ there is a slightly modified exact sequence.

3. If $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$, then $E_{\Lambda}^{+}(F, n-p) = 0$.

4. If $E_{\Lambda}^{+}(F, n-p) = 0$, then $Z_{F,\Lambda}^{n-p} = {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{+}(F, p))$.

In particular, $H^p(\Gamma, F) \cong Z_{F,\Lambda}^{n-p}$ by (4).

5. For $p \geq \frac{n}{2}$ we have $H^p(\Gamma, F) \cong Z_{F,\Lambda}^{n-p}$.

Assertion 5 says in particular that (3) is true in dimension $n = 2$. Since (4) is a sequence of finite-dimensional spaces which are related to (generalized) harmonic forms the theorem can be considered as a variant of Hodge theory. Up to now there is no example for which we can prove that the map $Z_{F,\Lambda}^{n-p} \rightarrow H^p(\Gamma, F)$ is not surjective. We always have $\dim Z_{F,\Lambda}^{n-p} \geq \dim H^p(\Gamma, F)$ (Proposition 6.5).

As already remarked by Patterson [57] and independently observed by Lott [48], Assertion 5 for $F = \mathbb{C}$ and $p \neq \frac{n}{2}$ follows from the results of Mazzeo and Phillips [50] on comparison of L^2 -cohomology with cohomology with compact support. Indeed, also our proof of Assertions 3-5 relies heavily on L^2 -methods which do not apply to $p < \frac{n}{2}$.

The theorem has an obvious generalization for Γ -representations of the form $F \otimes V$, where V is finite-dimensional and unitary (see Theorem 6.3). We will also consider the case of non-unitary V . In contrast to Assertions 3-5, Assertions 1 and 2 also hold in this case (for noncocompact Γ).

Strictly speaking, Theorem 1.2 and all the results reviewed in this introduction are proved under the additional assumption that Γ is torsion-free since we like to work in the category of smooth manifolds. Using the fact that Γ always has a torsion-free normal subgroup of finite index the results can be easily extended to the general case (compare the discussion at the beginning of Subsection 7.3).

The reader should be warned that this introduction is the only place in the present paper, where Eisenstein series are mentioned. Instead we will use the extension map ext_s which can be considered as a direct construction of the boundary values of Eisenstein series. The Eisenstein series are then obtained by composing ext_s with a suitable Poisson transform (see [21]).

1.2 Higher cohomology groups

The exact sequence (4) can also be viewed as the determination of the space of invariants of the Γ -module of distribution sections of $V^{+}(F, p)$ with support on the limit set in terms of

spectral data (boundary values of residues of Eisenstein series) and topological data (the cohomology groups $H^{n-p}(\Gamma, F)$). This space of invariants constitutes by definition the cohomology group $H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p)))$. As it is often the case a full understanding of the situation requires to know the higher cohomology groups $H^j(\Gamma, C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p)))$, $j > 0$, too. Indeed, in [57] Patterson spelled out a second conjecture stating that the dimensions of the spaces $H^j(\Gamma, C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(F, p)))$ are finite and should be related to the order of the singularity of a twisted Selberg zeta function at a certain integer point. We will discuss this conjecture in little more detail at the beginning of Section 8. It turns out that it is more appropriate to consider the spaces $C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))$, instead. Moreover, for technical reasons (see Subsection 1.3) we have to work with the Γ -modules $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))$ of hyperfunction sections supported on the limit set. It is relatively easy to see (Theorem 3.3) that

$$H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))) \cong H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))) .$$

One expects that this isomorphism remains to be true in higher degrees $j > 0$. Up to now this has been proved for cocompact Γ , only ([16], [18]). Results of this kind strongly depend on the fact that Γ does not contain parabolic elements. While we will say nothing substantial on the Selberg zeta function we will prove the following result (see Theorem 8.13).

Theorem 1.2 *For all $j \geq 1$, $p \neq \frac{n-1}{2}$, there is a natural isomorphism*

$$H^j(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))) \cong H^{n-p+j}(\Gamma, F) .$$

For $p = \frac{n-1}{2}$ there is a splitting $V(F, \frac{n-1}{2}) = V(F, +) \oplus V(F, -)$. Then

$$H^j(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(F, +))) \cong H^j(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(F, -))) \cong H^{\frac{n+1}{2}+j}(\Gamma, F) .$$

In particular, the spaces $H^j(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p)))$ are finite-dimensional.

Again, it is allowed to incorporate twists by finite-dimensional Γ -representations into the theorem. We also gain information on the spaces $H^j(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(F, p)))$. In particular, they are finite-dimensional. A result which implies Theorem 1.2 in the special case of spherical F and $p = n - 1$ was already obtained in [19].

The bundles $V(F, p)$ sit inside families of irreducible G -homogeneous bundles $V(\sigma_\lambda)$ parametrized by irreducible representations of the isotropy group P of the chosen base point in ∂X . We call such a representation very special if $V(\sigma_\lambda)$ is one of the bundles $V(F, p)$, $p \neq 0$, $V(F, \pm)$. Moreover, it is natural to deal with the more general framework of a linear real rank one Lie group G and a convex cocompact discrete subgroup $\Gamma \subset G$. Again we have the symmetric space X , the limit set Λ sitting in its geodesic boundary ∂X , and homogeneous vector bundles $V(\sigma_\lambda) \rightarrow \partial X$. The spaces $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ of their hyperfunction sections constitute the principal series representations of G . There is also a notion of very special parameters σ_λ (Definition 4.7). Unless stated otherwise, we will exclude the exceptional symmetric space $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$ from the considerations. We then have Γ -modules $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$ and a finite-dimensional subspace $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda)) = H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda)))$ generated by the singular part of ext_s at $s = \lambda$. Again it is conjectured that the order of the singularity at λ of the Selberg zeta function associated to σ is related to the dimensions of the cohomology groups of Γ with coefficients in $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$.

Theorem 1.3 *Let G be as above, $\Gamma \subset G$ convex cocompact, and σ_λ not very special. Then*

$$H^j(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))) = \{0\} \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1 .$$

If, in addition, Γ is not cocompact, then

$$H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))) = E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda) .$$

This theorem combines the assertions of Proposition 4.16 and Theorem 8.9. It would be desirable to extend also Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to the general rank one situation. However, for complex and quaternionic hyperbolic spaces the structure of analogous results is expected to be much more involved.

The proof of each of the above theorems is based on three essential ingredients: the surjectivity of Laplace-like operators on smooth sections of vector bundles over connected non-compact Riemannian manifolds, a geometric version of scattering theory (developed in joint work with Ulrich Bunke mainly in [21]), where the above mentioned operator ext_s plays an essential role, and the theory of Poisson transforms for homogeneous vector bundles over symmetric spaces (which is essentially the theory of asymptotic expansions of matrix coefficients of admissible G -representations). The latter two ingredients allow us to follow a strategy which became more and more popular and promising during the last years, even in the classical case of finite volume quotients $Y = \Gamma \backslash X$, namely, study automorphic forms via the behaviour of their boundary distributions (compare [62], [6], [12], [47], [48], [51], [30], [39], and the joint papers of the author with U. Bunke [18], [20], [21], [23]).

1.3 The structure of the paper and side results

Section 2 contains a couple of remarks on the surjectivity of the p -form Laplacian on non-compact connected Riemannian manifolds. We obtain a weak form of Hodge theory which in particular says that any de Rham cohomology class has a coclosed harmonic representative. These facts, though based on classical results, do not seem to have been systematically studied so far. See, however, the note [31].

Sections 3 and 4 appear as a longish commentary on [21] and parts of [19]. Since we only know the surjectivity of the Laplacian on the space of all smooth forms (or smooth sections of more general vector bundles) and not on the space of forms of moderate growth (see the discussion in Subsection 7.3) we are forced to redevelop the theory of the extension operator ext_s for convex cocompact groups acting on symmetric spaces of negative curvature in a hyperfunction setting (note that the boundary value of an arbitrary eigensection is a hyperfunction while eigensections of moderate growth have distribution boundary values). This is entirely parallel to the corresponding theory for distributions treated in [21]. In Section 4 we introduce and study the spaces ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$ and $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda)$. In particular, we show that they are finite-dimensional. For $\text{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$ we draw some consequences of unitarity which go beyond the results of [21], Section 7. In particular, we obtain the following new results which are of independent interest:

- (i) The operator ext_λ is regular at such non-negative λ which correspond to regular integral infinitesimal character (Proposition 4.21). This in particular implies Assertion 3 of Theorem 1.1.
- (ii) If $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ and σ is a faithful representation of $Spin(n-1)$, then ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_0)) = \{0\}$ (Proposition 4.23).
- (iii) If $X = \mathbb{H}H^n$ or $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$ and Γ is not cocompact, then the Hausdorff dimension of Λ is strictly less than $4n$ or 16 , respectively (Corollary 4.22). This slightly improves a result of Corlette [26]. Note that in these cases the Hausdorff dimension of ∂X is equal to $4n + 2$ and 22 , respectively.

The reader who is mainly interested in the consequences of these results for spectral theory and L^2 -cohomology can directly jump to Section 9. There we give a slightly refined version of the Plancherel Theorem for $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G)$ obtained in [21]. For instance, thanks to (ii) we now know that in the real hyperbolic case limits of discrete series representations do not contribute to the discrete spectrum. Based on the Plancherel Theorem we compute the L^2 -cohomology of $Y = \Gamma \backslash X$ with coefficients in the flat bundle E_F induced by a finite-dimensional G -representation by standard relative Lie algebra cohomology methods (Theorem 9.8). Again, the result will be mainly in terms of invariant distributions supported on the limit set. It follows that these cohomology groups are finite-dimensional except for the middle degree.

In Sections 5 and 6 we have to assume that $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$. They culminate in the proof of Theorem 1.2. The reason for the restriction to the real hyperbolic case is that for the remaining cases the theory of Poisson transforms for harmonic differential forms is neither developed sufficiently far nor would it be possible to use it in order to translate the Hodge theoretic results of Section 2 directly to the boundary (e.g., an appropriate Hodge theory for quotients of the complex hyperbolic space should involve a filtration by bidegrees). For the real hyperbolic case the theory of Poisson transforms of differential forms is well understood [30]. In Section 5 we adjust this theory according to our needs. Combining it with the results of Section 4 we obtain a proof of Theorem 1.2 for the special case $F = \mathbb{C}$ (except for Assertion 5 in case $p = \frac{n}{2}$), but with arbitrary twists allowed. The general case follows by an application of the translation functor (Section 6) which is well-known in representation theory. The proof of Assertion 5 in case $p = \frac{n}{2}$ is then a consequence of the theory of discrete series representations combined with various scalar product formulas as e.g. Proposition 4.17.

In Subsection 7.1 we derive some vanishing results for cohomology based on Theorem 1.1. In Subsection 7.2 we study of the relation of the spaces $Z_{F,\Lambda}^p$ to cohomology with compact support.

For any Riemannian locally symmetric space there is the notion of automorphic forms which involves the condition of moderate growth. Gaillard [32] formulated a conjecture which he calls the Harder-Borel conjecture and which states that the subcomplexes of the de Rham complex consisting of coclosed harmonic automorphic forms and of automorphic forms, respectively, are quasi-isomorphic to the full de Rham complex. The problem is widely investigated in the special and most interesting case of finite volume spaces. In our situation (G of rank one,

$\Gamma \subset G$ convex cocompact) the conjecture would immediately follow if we would know that the Laplacian acting on forms of moderate growth is surjective. Such an assertion, however, seems to be very difficult to prove. Theorem 1.1 provides representatives of cohomology classes by (boundary values of) very special automorphic forms. This does not imply the conjecture yet. In Subsection 7.3 we provide some additional arguments which together with Assertion 2 of Theorem 1.1 show that the Harder-Borel conjecture is true for quotients of the real hyperbolic space by a convex cocompact subgroup.

Section 8 is devoted to the proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.2. Here we make use of several ideas already employed in [14] and [19]. The main step is to compute the higher cohomology groups of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$. The first observation we make is that generalized eigenspaces of Laplacians on homogeneous vector bundles over X are acyclic Γ -modules (Lemma 8.2). Here again the surjectivity of elliptic operators on analytic noncompact manifolds (see Section 2) becomes crucial. Then we show that for parameters σ_λ which are not very special suitably chosen Poisson transforms map $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$ isomorphically to a direct summand of such a generalized eigenspace. Especially for $\lambda = 0$ this requires a thorough discussion of various cases. It follows that all higher cohomology groups of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$ vanish. If $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ and σ_λ is very special, then the theory developed in Sections 2, 5, and 6 implies that certain de Rham complexes of generalized harmonic forms provide acyclic resolutions of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$. This establishes the connection to the cohomology groups $H^p(\Gamma, F)$. In the final step we use the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\Omega, V^+(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow 0$$

in order to conclude that for all $p \geq 1$

$$H^p(C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))) \cong H^p(C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))) .$$

For $p = 1$ this uses the meromorphy of ext_s .

We expect that Theorem 1.1 has a natural generalization to arbitrary geometrically finite groups Γ acting on $\mathbb{R}H^n$. Note, however, that in this generality the spaces ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(F, p))$ and ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(F, p))$ can be infinite-dimensional. In order to obtain finite-dimensional spaces one should replace the condition “supported on the limit set” by “strongly supported on the limit set” (see [23]). Indeed, the meromorphy of ext_s in the distribution setting has been established in [20], and the singular part of ext produces invariant distributions which are “strongly supported on the limit set”. However, it is far from being obvious how to transfer this theory to a hyperfunction setting.

In the special case of finite volume quotients there is an alternative approach. In this case $\Lambda = \partial X$ and $\dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(F, p)) < \infty$. Thus there is no need to “move” the (strong) support of the boundary value of a harmonic form to the limit set and therefore things can be done without considering the extended bundles $V^k(F, p)$ and $V^+(F, p)$. Moreover, in this case Hodge theory on forms of moderate growth is established (see the discussion in Subsection 7.3, in particular Proposition 7.11). Therefore one can work from the very beginning in the distribution setting. Arguing as in the proof of Corollary 5.4 we obtain

Proposition 1.4 *Let Γ be such that $Y = \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{R}H^n$ has finite volume. Let F be a finite-dimensional G -representation as above. Let $E(F, p) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(F, p))$ be the subspace spanned by the boundary values of the (not necessarily singular) leading terms of the Eisenstein series $E_{F,s}^p(\phi)$ at $s = s_{F,p}$ (see 1.1). By Z_F^p we denote the space of Γ -invariant cocycles of (2). Then there are exact sequences*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\rightarrow E(F, p) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(F, p)) \rightarrow H^p(\Gamma, F) \rightarrow 0, \quad p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}, \\ 0 &\rightarrow E(F, p) \cap Z_F^p \rightarrow Z_F^p \rightarrow H^p(\Gamma, F) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgements: First of all I want to thank Ulrich Bunke. Most of the results of this paper strongly depend on ideas developed in previous joint work with him. Stimulating discussions with him accompanied also the work on the present paper. I am indebted to S. J. Patterson whose conjectures and insightful remarks were a kind of orientation guide not only for this work. Discussions with A. Juhl, who also carefully read previous versions of the manuscript, and P.-Y. Gaillard substantially influenced my view on the subject, too.

2 A residue of Hodge theory for noncompact Riemannian manifolds

Given a smooth manifold Y and a flat finite-dimensional complex vector bundle (E, ∇) on it we can consider the associated de Rham complex

$$(\Omega^*(Y, E), d)$$

of smooth, E -valued differential forms, i.e., smooth sections of the bundles $\Lambda^*(T^*Y) \otimes E$. Here the differential

$$d : \Omega^p(Y, E) \rightarrow \Omega^{p+1}(Y, E) .$$

is induced by the flat connection

$$\nabla : \Omega^0(Y, E) \rightarrow \Omega^1(Y, E) .$$

We are interested in its cohomology groups $H^p(Y, E)$. The most important case is the one-dimensional trivial bundle equipped with the trivial connection. The cohomology of the corresponding de Rham complex then becomes canonically isomorphic to the usual (say singular) cohomology $H^*(Y, \mathbb{C})$ of Y with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}$. For us a manifold always has a countable base of the topology. For convenience we assume Y to be connected.

Let g be a Riemannian metric on Y , and let h be a Hermitian metric on E . We do not require h to be parallel with respect to ∇ . These structures induce the Riemannian measure μ_g on Y and Hermitian forms $(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $\Lambda^p(T^*Y) \otimes E$. Then we can form the formal adjoint of d

$$\delta : \Omega^{p+1}(Y, E) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E)$$

which is characterized by

$$\int_Y (\delta \omega_y, \eta_y) d\mu(y) = \int_Y (\omega_y, d\eta_y) d\mu(y) \quad \text{for all } \omega \in \Omega^{p+1}(Y, E), \eta \in \Omega_c^p(Y, E) .$$

Here the subscript c means compact support. We have $\delta^2 = 0$. The corresponding p -form Laplacian is given by

$$\Delta = \delta d + d\delta : \Omega^p(Y, E) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E) .$$

d and δ commute with the elliptic and formally selfadjoint operator Δ .

These operators give rise to three distinguished subcomplexes

$$\Omega^*(Y, E)_{\Delta, \delta} \subset \Omega^*(Y, E)_{\Delta} \subset \Omega^*(Y, E)_{(\Delta)}$$

of the de Rham complex $(\Omega^*(Y, E), d)$, namely

- $\Omega^p(Y, E)_{\Delta, \delta} := \{\omega \in \Omega^p(Y, E) \mid \Delta\omega = 0, \delta\omega = 0\}$ (coclosed harmonic forms),
- $\Omega^p(Y, E)_{\Delta} := \{\omega \in \Omega^p(Y, E) \mid \Delta\omega = 0\}$ (harmonic forms),

- $\Omega^p(Y, E)_{(\Delta)} := \{\omega \in \Omega^p(Y, E) \mid \text{there exists } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } \Delta^k \omega = 0\}$ (generalized harmonic forms).

If Y is compact, then by classical Hodge theory all these complexes coincide with $\ker d \cap \ker \delta$, are finite-dimensional and provide canonical representatives of cohomology classes by harmonic forms. For noncompact Y all these statements are false. However, one of the main results of the present section is that in general at least the following is true.

Theorem 2.1 *The inclusions of complexes*

$$\Omega^*(Y, E)_{\Delta, \delta} \hookrightarrow \Omega^*(Y, E)_{(\Delta)} \hookrightarrow \Omega^*(Y, E)$$

are quasi-isomorphisms, i.e., they induce isomorphisms in cohomology.

For noncompact manifolds the inclusion $\Omega^*(Y, E)_{\Delta} \xrightarrow{i} \Omega^*(Y, E)$ is far from being a quasi-isomorphism in general. In fact, one can show that $i \oplus (-1)^* \delta : \Omega^*(Y, E)_{\Delta} \longrightarrow \Omega^*(Y, E) \oplus \Omega^{*-1}(Y, E)$ is a quasi-isomorphism, i.e., for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there is a canonical isomorphism

$$H^p(\Omega^*(Y, E)_{\Delta}) \cong H^p(Y, E) \oplus H^{p-1}(Y, E) .$$

The theorem is a simple consequence of the surjectivity of the Laplacian on $\Omega^p(Y, E)$ for noncompact manifolds, a classical result which goes back to Malgrange [49] but which does not seem to have received much attention among global analysts. We will discuss this result in a moment. It has been used in several joint papers of U. Bunke and the author ([14], [19]). The validity of Theorem 2.1 was independently observed by P.-Y. Gaillard [31] to whom I am also indebted for providing adequate references.

First we need the following

Definition 2.2 *Let E_1, E_2 be vector bundles over Y . We say that a differential operator*

$$D : C^\infty(Y, E_1) \rightarrow C^\infty(Y, E_2)$$

has the weak unique continuation property if for any connected open subset $U \subset Y$, any section $f \in C^{-\infty}(U, E_1)$ with $Df = 0$ the condition $f|_{U_0} = 0$ for a nonempty open subset $U_0 \subset U$ implies $f \equiv 0$ on U .

If Y, E_1, E_2 are analytic, and D is an elliptic operator with analytic coefficients, then D has the weak unique continuation property by analytic elliptic regularity (see e.g. [37], Thm. 8.6.1 or [41], Thm. 3.4.4). In fact, in this case $Df = 0$ implies that f is analytic. But for operators like Δ this analyticity condition is not necessary for unique continuation. Indeed, in the setting introduced above the form Laplacians $\Delta : \Omega^p(Y, E) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E)$ have the weak unique continuation property ([1]). For an overview concerning unique continuation theorems we refer to [43]. We now have

Theorem 2.3 ([49], p.341) *Let Y be a connected noncompact smooth manifold, and let*

$$D : C^\infty(Y, E_1) \rightarrow C^\infty(Y, E_2)$$

be an elliptic operator which has the weak unique continuation property. Then D is surjective.

In view of the above discussion this implies

Corollary 2.4 *The p -form Laplacian $\Delta : \Omega^p(Y, E) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E)$ on a noncompact connected smooth manifold is surjective.*

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For compact manifolds the theorem is covered by classical Hodge theory (see e.g. [70], Sect. IV.5). Thus we may assume that Y is noncompact. We first show that the inclusion $\Omega^*(Y, E)_{\Delta, \delta} \hookrightarrow \Omega^*(Y, E)$ induces a surjection in cohomology. Let $\omega \in \Omega^p(Y, E)$ be closed. By Corollary 2.4 we find $\eta \in \Omega^p(Y, E)$ solving the equation $\Delta\eta = \omega$. Set

$$\omega_0 := \omega - d\delta\eta = \delta d\eta .$$

Then ω_0 is cohomologous to ω and coclosed. In particular, $\omega_0 \in \Omega^p(Y, E)_{\Delta, \delta}$. This proves the desired surjectivity.

For injectivity we consider $\phi \in \Omega^{p-1}(Y, E)$, $\omega = d\phi$. Solving $\Delta\eta = \phi$ in $\Omega^{p-1}(Y, E)$ we can form $\phi_0 := \phi - d\delta\eta = \delta d\eta$. Then $d\phi_0 = \omega$, $\delta\phi_0 = 0$, $\Delta\phi_0 = \delta d\phi_0 = \delta\omega$.

If $\omega \in \Omega^p(Y, E)_{\Delta, \delta}$, then $\Delta\phi_0 = \delta\omega = 0$, i.e., $\phi_0 \in \Omega^{p-1}(Y, E)_{\Delta, \delta}$. Thus in this case ω is a coboundary in $\Omega^*(Y, E)_{\Delta, \delta}$. If $\Delta^k\omega = 0$ for some $k \geq 1$, then

$$\Delta^{k+1}\phi_0 = \Delta^k\delta\omega = \delta\Delta^k\omega = 0 .$$

Hence ω is a coboundary in $\Omega^*(Y, E)_{(\Delta)}$. Thus we have shown that both injections of complexes induce injective maps in cohomology. The proof is now complete. $\square$

There is an alternative way of expressing cohomology in terms of generalized harmonic forms which will turn out to be crucial in the proof of the main theorem of the present paper. By $Z^p(Y, E)_{(\Delta)}$ we denote the space of p -cocycles in $\Omega^*(Y, E)_{(\Delta)}$.

Proposition 2.5 *A p -form $\omega \in \Omega^p(Y, E)$ is exact if and only if there exists a closed p -form η such that $\Delta\eta = \omega$. In particular we have*

$$H^p(Y, E) \cong Z^p(Y, E)_{(\Delta)} / \Delta \left(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\Delta)} \right) \cong \ker d \cap \ker \delta / \Delta \left(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\Delta)} \right) \cap \ker \delta . \quad (5)$$

Moreover,

$$\Delta \left(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\Delta)} \right) = \Delta^k \left(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\Delta)} \right) \quad \text{for any } k \in \mathbb{N} . \quad (6)$$

Proof. For compact manifolds the proposition is a consequence of classical Hodge theory. Thus we can assume that Y is noncompact. If η is closed, then $\Delta\eta = d\delta\eta$ is exact. On the other hand, for exact $\omega = d\phi$ we use Corollary 2.4 in order to solve the equation $\Delta\psi = \phi$ and set $\eta = d\psi$. Then

$$\Delta\eta = d\Delta\psi = \omega .$$

This proves the first assertion. Since according to Theorem 2.1 any cohomology class can be represented by a generalized harmonic form, or even by a closed and coclosed form, Equation (5) follows, too. Let now $\omega = d\delta\eta \in \Delta(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\Delta)})$. By Corollary 2.4 we can solve $\Delta^k\psi = \delta\eta$. Then $\omega = \Delta^k d\psi \in \Delta^k(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\Delta)})$. This proves (6) and finishes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

There is another canonical codifferential $\hat{\delta}$ acting on $\Omega^*(Y, E)$ which only depends on the Riemannian metric g but not on any chosen Hermitian metric on E . Indeed, let

$$\delta_1 : \Omega^p(Y) \rightarrow \Omega^{p-1}(Y)$$

be the usual codifferential for the trivial bundle. Then we define

$$\hat{\delta} : \Omega^p(Y, E) \cong C^\infty(Y, \Lambda^p T^*Y \otimes E) \rightarrow \Omega^{p-1}(Y, E)$$

by

$$\hat{\delta}(\omega \otimes e) := \delta_1\omega \otimes e - i_g(\nabla e)\omega , \quad (7)$$

where

$$i_g : \Omega^1(Y, E) \otimes \Omega^p(Y) \rightarrow \Omega^{p-1}(Y, E)$$

is the insertion operator defined by the Riemannian metric g . Again we have $\hat{\delta}^2 = 0$. $\hat{\delta}$ coincides with δ if and only if the Hermitian metric h is parallel. We form

$$\hat{\Delta} = \hat{\delta}d + d\hat{\delta} : \Omega^p(Y, E) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E) .$$

$\hat{\Delta}$ is elliptic and commutes with d and $\hat{\delta}$. But in general there is no L^2 -scalar product on $\Omega^p(Y, E)$ such that $\hat{\Delta}$ becomes formally selfadjoint. Replacing in the above definitions Δ by $\hat{\Delta}$ and δ by $\hat{\delta}$ we obtain new subcomplexes of $(\Omega^*(Y, E), d)$

$$\Omega^*(Y, E)_{\hat{\Delta}, \hat{\delta}} \subset \Omega^*(Y, E)_{\hat{\Delta}} \subset \Omega^*(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} .$$

While classical Hodge theory does not work if $\hat{\Delta}$ is not selfadjoint the same arguing as above yields

Corollary 2.6 *The Laplacian $\hat{\Delta} : \Omega^p(Y, E) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E)$ on a noncompact connected smooth manifold is surjective.*

Thus the same proofs as above show that for noncompact manifolds we are allowed to put a hat on the operators appearing in Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.5.

Theorem 2.7 *Let Y be noncompact. Then the inclusions of complexes*

$$\Omega^*(Y, E)_{\hat{\Delta}, \hat{\delta}} \hookrightarrow \Omega^*(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} \hookrightarrow \Omega^*(Y, E)$$

are quasi-isomorphisms, i.e., they induce isomorphisms in cohomology.

Proposition 2.8 *Let Y be noncompact. A p -form $\omega \in \Omega^p(Y, E)$ is exact if and only if there exists a closed p -form η such that $\hat{\Delta}\eta = \omega$. In particular we have*

$$H^p(Y, E) \cong Z^p(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} / \hat{\Delta} \left(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right) \cong \ker d \cap \ker \hat{\delta} / \hat{\Delta} \left(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right) \cap \ker \hat{\delta} . \quad (8)$$

Moreover,

$$\hat{\Delta} \left(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right) = \hat{\Delta}^k \left(Z^p(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right) \quad \text{for any } k \in \mathbb{N} . \quad (9)$$

For compact manifolds Theorem 2.7 and Proposition 2.8 are not true in general. However, we have

Proposition 2.9 *Let Y be compact. There exists a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Omega^p(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} = \ker \hat{\Delta}^k$ for all p . In particular, $\dim \Omega^*(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} < \infty$. There is a decomposition of complexes*

$$\Omega^*(Y, E) = \Omega^*(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} \oplus \hat{\Delta}^k (\Omega^*(Y, E)) . \quad (10)$$

The embedding $\Omega^(Y, E)_{(\hat{\Delta})} \hookrightarrow \Omega^*(Y, E)$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. We choose a Hermitian metric h on E . Then we can form the codifferential δ , the Laplacians Δ as above, and the Hilbert space completion $L^2(Y, \Lambda^p T^*Y \otimes E)$ of $\Omega^p(Y, E)$. The difference $\hat{\delta} - \delta$ is an operator of order zero, hence $T := \hat{\Delta} - \Delta$ has at most first order. Δ becomes an unbounded selfadjoint operator with the Sobolev space $H^2(Y, \Lambda^p T^*Y \otimes E)$ as its domain of definition. T as well as $\hat{\Delta} = \Delta + T$ are defined on $H^2(Y, \Lambda^p T^*Y \otimes E)$, and $T(1 + \Delta)^{-1}$ defines a compact operator on $L^2(Y, \Lambda^p T^*Y)$. As a relative compact perturbation of Δ the operator $\hat{\Delta}$ inherits from Δ the property that

$$\dim \bigcup_l \ker(\hat{\Delta}^l) < \infty , \quad L^2(Y, \Lambda^p T^*Y) = \bigcup_l \ker(\hat{\Delta}^l) \oplus \bigcap_l \text{im}(\hat{\Delta}^l) \quad (11)$$

(see [33], Ch. V, Lemma 10.1). In fact, this becomes a simple consequence of the compactness of the resolvent $(\hat{\Delta} - \lambda)^{-1}$ as soon one knows that the resolvent set of $\hat{\Delta}$ is not empty which can be ensured by

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow i\infty} \|T(\Delta - \lambda)^{-1}\| = 0 \quad ([33], \text{ Ch. V, Lemma 7.2}) .$$

By elliptic regularity $\bigcup_l \ker(\hat{\Delta}^l) \subset \Omega^p(Y, E)$. Equation (10) now follows from (11).

As in the proof of Theorem 2.1 one shows that any cohomology class in $H^p(\hat{\Delta}^k(\Omega^*(Y, E)))$ has a $\hat{\Delta}$ -harmonic representative. Now (10) implies that it is zero. This finishes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

3 Scattering theory for convex cocompact groups: the hyperfunction setting

The main purpose of this section is to transfer the results of [21], Sections 4-5, from distributions to hyperfunctions. First we have to recall the setting of that paper.

Let G be a connected, linear, real simple Lie group of rank one. We fix a maximal compact subgroup $K \subset G$ and an Iwasawa decomposition $G = KAN$ of G . Note that the rank one assumption is equivalent to $\dim A = 1$. Let $M := Z_K(A)$ be the centralizer of A in K . We denote the Lie algebras of these groups by $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathfrak{k}$, $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{n}$, and $\mathfrak{m}$, respectively. We form the corresponding minimal parabolic subgroup $P := MAN$ of G . The group G acts isometrically and orientation-preserving on the rank-one symmetric space $X := G/K$. Let $\partial X := G/P = K/M$ be its geodesic boundary. We consider $\bar{X} := X \cup \partial X$ as a compact manifold with boundary.

Let $\Gamma \subset G$ be a discrete torsion-free subgroup. Its limit set $\Lambda \subset \partial X$ is defined to be the set of accumulation points in $X \cup \partial X$ of the Γ -orbit of an arbitrary point $x \in X$. The complement $\Omega := \partial X \setminus \Lambda$ is called the domain of discontinuity of Γ . Indeed, Γ acts properly discontinuously on Ω as well as on $X \cup \Omega$. Hence, $\bar{Y} := \Gamma \backslash (X \cup \Omega)$ is a manifold with boundary $B := \Gamma \backslash \Omega$. Its interior $Y := \Gamma \backslash X$ carries the structure of a locally symmetric space of negative sectional curvature. We assume Γ to be convex cocompact which means by definition that $\bar{Y}$ is compact. In particular, a cocompact subgroup is convex cocompact. In this case $\Lambda = \partial X$, $\Omega = \emptyset$, and $\bar{Y} = Y$ is a compact locally symmetric space. We are mostly interested in the opposite case $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. Then Y is a locally symmetric space of infinite volume without cusps which we will call a Kleinian manifold generalizing the corresponding notion for three-dimensional hyperbolic manifolds.

By $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ we denote the complexified dual of $\mathfrak{a}$. For $a \in A$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ we set $a^\lambda := e^{\langle \lambda, \log(a) \rangle} \in \mathbb{C}$. Let α be the short root of $\mathfrak{a}$ in $\mathfrak{n}$. We set $A_+ := \{a \in A \mid a^\alpha \geq 1\}$. Define $\rho \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ as usual by $\rho(H) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\text{ad}(H)|_{\mathfrak{n}})$, $\forall H \in \mathfrak{a}$. We have

X	$\mathbb{R}H^n$	$\mathbb{C}H^n$	$\mathbb{H}H^n$	$\mathbb{O}H^2$
ρ	$\frac{n-1}{2}\alpha$	$n\alpha$	$(2n+1)\alpha$	11α

Any element $g \in G$ has a Cartan decomposition $g = k_g a_g h$, $k_g, h \in K$, $a_g \in A_+$, where a_g and $k_g M \in K/M$ are uniquely determined by g .

Definition 3.1 *The critical exponent $\delta_\Gamma \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ of Γ is the smallest element such that the series $\sum_{g \in \Gamma} a_g^{-(\lambda + \rho)}$ converges for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ with $\lambda > \delta_\Gamma$. If Γ is the trivial group, then we set $\delta_\Gamma := -\infty$.*

If (τ, V_τ) is a finite-dimensional representation of P , then we denote by $V(\tau) := G \times_P V_\tau$ the associated homogeneous vector bundle over $\partial X = G/P$. It induces a bundle on $B = \Gamma \backslash \Omega$ defined by $V_B(\tau) := \Gamma \backslash V(\tau)|_\Omega$. These bundles are defined in the analytic category. Therefore

we can consider not only smooth and distribution sections but also analytic and hyperfunction sections of these bundles. Of main interest are the P -representations σ_λ which arise as follows. Let (σ, V_σ) be a finite-dimensional unitary representation of M . For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ we form the representation σ_λ of P on $V_{\sigma_\lambda} := V_\sigma$, which is given by $\sigma_\lambda(man) := \sigma(m)a^{\rho-\lambda}$. There is a chain of inclusions of continuous G -representations (called principal series representations) on complete locally convex Hausdorff topological vector spaces

$$C^\omega(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \subset C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \subset C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \subset C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$$

which we all denote by $\pi^{\sigma, \lambda}$. There is a corresponding chain of inclusions of spaces of sections over B . Let $\tilde{\sigma}$ be the dual representation to σ . Since $\Lambda^{max} T^* \partial X \cong V(1-\rho)$ and ∂X and B are compact we have

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) &= C^\sharp(\partial X, V(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}))' \\ C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda)) &= C^\sharp(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}))', \quad \sharp \in \{\infty, \omega\}. \end{aligned}$$

As explained in [21], p. 86, we can equip

$$\bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*} V(\sigma_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \times \partial X \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*} V_B(\sigma_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \times B$$

with the structure of holomorphic families of bundles.

The structure of a holomorphic family of bundles allows us to consider holomorphic and meromorphic families of sections $U \ni \mu \mapsto f_\mu \in C^{\pm\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\mu))$, $U \ni \mu \mapsto f_\mu \in C^{\pm\sharp}(B, V_B(\sigma_\mu))$, $U \subset \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ open, as well as meromorphic families of continuous operators between such section spaces in the sense of meromorphic functions with values in topological vector spaces. Here we equip the space of continuous linear operators between two such spaces with the topology of uniform convergence on bounded sets. For a discussion of these notions we refer to [21], p. 87, and [19], Section 2.2. Let us recall that a meromorphic family of operators is said to have a finite-dimensional singularity at $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ if the coefficients of the principal part of the Laurent expansion at λ are operators of finite rank.

Let (φ, V_φ) be a finite-dimensional representation of Γ . We form the bundle $V(\tau, \varphi) := V(\tau) \otimes V_\varphi$ on ∂X carrying the tensor product action of Γ and define $V_B(\tau, \varphi) := \Gamma \backslash (V(\tau) \otimes V_\varphi)|_\Omega$. In particular, we have the spaces of sections $C^{\pm\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ and $C^{\pm\sharp}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ as well as the various notions of $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ -parametrized families of sections and operators.

We chose some norm on V_φ . Since Γ is finitely generated we can find an element $\mu \in \mathfrak{a}^*$, $\mu \geq 0$, and a constant C such that

$$\|\varphi(g)\| \leq C a_g^\mu \quad \text{for all } g \in \Gamma. \quad (12)$$

Definition 3.2 Let $\delta_\varphi \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ be the infimum of all $\mu \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ satisfying Equation (12) for some C . It is independent of the chosen norm. We call δ_φ the exponent of (φ, V_φ) .

The goal of the present section is to develop the technical means needed for the understanding of the spaces of Γ -invariant hyperfunction sections ${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ and its subspaces ${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ of those Γ -invariant hyperfunction sections on ∂X which are supported on the limit set. The starting point is the restriction map

$$res : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

which is given by the restriction res_Ω of a hyperfunction section of $V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ to the open subset $\Omega \subset \partial X$ followed by the identification ${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\Omega, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \cong C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. Then ${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = \ker res$. If $\Omega \neq \emptyset$, then we are going to construct a meromorphic family $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \ni \lambda \mapsto ext_\lambda$,

$$ext_\lambda : C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) ,$$

of right inverses of res . This has already been done for the case of the real hyperbolic space and trivial representations $\sigma = 1$ and $\varphi = 1$ in [19]. For general rank one spaces (with the exception of the Cayley hyperbolic plane $\mathbb{O}H^2$) and bundles the analogous construction for distribution sections has been carried out in [21]. We shall follow these references quite closely.

Let us begin with a comparison theorem which is independent of the theory of ext_λ , and which also holds in the cocompact case $\Omega = \emptyset$.

Theorem 3.3 *Let τ and φ be finite-dimensional representations of P and Γ , respectively. Then a Γ -invariant hyperfunction section $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tau, \varphi))$ is a distribution section if and only if $res(f) \in C^{-\infty}(B, V_B(\tau, \varphi))$. In particular,*

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\tau, \varphi)) = {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\tau, \varphi)) .$$

Proof. We fix an M -invariant Hermitian scalar product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $V_{\tilde{\tau}}$. Completing $C^\infty(\partial X, V(\tilde{\tau} \otimes 1_{-\rho}))$ with respect to the inner product

$$(\phi, \psi) := \int_K (\phi(k), \psi(k)) dk$$

we obtain the Hilbert space $H = L^2(\partial X, V(\tilde{\tau} \otimes 1_{-\rho}))$. Here we view $\phi, \psi \in C^\infty(\partial X, V(\tilde{\tau} \otimes 1_{-\rho}))$ as functions on G with values in $V_{\tilde{\tau}}$. H carries a continuous representation π of G , and its subspace H_∞ of smooth vectors coincides with $C^\infty(\partial X, V(\tilde{\tau} \otimes 1_{-\rho}))$ as a smooth Fréchet representation. Thus the dual space $(H_\infty)'$ coincides with $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\tau))$. We therefore want to show that $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tau, \varphi))$ defines an element in $(H_\infty)' \otimes V_\varphi$, whenever $res(f) \in C^{-\infty}(B, V_B(\tau, \varphi))$.

Let H_K be the subspace of K -finite vectors of H . Then according to [69], Lemma 11.6.1 and Proposition 11.6.2 a functional f on H_K extends continuously to H_∞ if and only if for all $\phi \in H_K$ the matrix coefficients $c_{f, \phi}$, defined by

$$c_{f, \phi}(g) := \langle f, \pi(g)\phi \rangle ,$$

are analytic functions on G having moderate growth, i.e., there exist constants $C_{f,\phi} \in \mathbb{R}$, $d_f \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ such that for all $g \in G$

$$|c_{f,\phi}(g)| \leq C_{f,\phi} a_g^{d_f}.$$

Since $\bar{Y}$ is compact we find a compact set $F \subset X \cup \Omega$ such that $\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \gamma F = X \cup \Omega$. Set $F_\infty := F \cap \Omega$, $F_G := FK \subset G$.

If $f \in C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tau, \varphi))$ then we can form matrix coefficients $c_{f,\phi}$ with elements in $\phi \in H_K$ as above which are now V_φ -valued functions. If $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tau, \varphi))$ such that $\text{res}(f) \in C^{-\infty}(B, V_B(\tau, \varphi))$, then we can find $f_1 \in C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tau, \varphi))$ supported on some compact subset $Q \subset \partial X \setminus F$ such that $f_2 := f - f_1 \in C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\tau, \varphi))$. By the above we find constants $C_{2,\phi}$, $d_2 \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ such that for all $g \in G$

$$|c_{f_2,\phi}(g)| \leq C_{2,\phi} a_g^{d_2}. \quad (13)$$

Note that $H_K \subset C^\omega(\partial X, V(\tilde{\tau} \otimes 1_{-\rho}))$. We now need the following lemma (compare [21], Equation (37)).

Lemma 3.4 *Let $Q \subset \partial X$, $L \subset G$ be compact such that $gP \notin Q$ for all $g \in L$. Let $f \in C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tau, \varphi))$ with $\text{supp} f \subset Q$ and $\phi \in C^\omega(\partial X, V(\tilde{\tau} \otimes 1_{-\rho}))$. Then there exists a constant C such that for all $g \in L$, $a \in A_+$, $k \in K$*

$$|c_{f,\phi}(gak)| \leq C a^{-2\rho} \|\tau(a)\|.$$

Proof. Let $w \in N_K(\mathfrak{a}) \setminus M$ be a representative of the nontrivial element of the Weyl group $W(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a}) \cong N_K(\mathfrak{a})/M \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Then by the Bruhat decomposition of G we have $\partial X \setminus eP = NwP$. Thus we can view ϕ as a $V_{\tilde{\tau}}$ valued function on Nw . We have

$$(\pi(ak)\phi)(nw) = (\pi(k)\phi)(a^{-1}nw) = a^{-2\rho} \tilde{\tau}(a) (\pi(k)\phi)(a^{-1}nwa^{-1}) = a^{-2\rho} \tilde{\tau}(a) (\pi(k)\phi)(a^{-1}naw).$$

Since $gP \notin Q$ for all $g \in L$ there is a compact subset $N_0 \subset N$ such that for all $g \in L$ the support of the hyperfunctions $nw \mapsto (\tilde{\pi}(g^{-1})f)(nw) = f(gnw)$ is contained in N_0w . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |c_{f,\phi}(gak)| &= |\langle f, \pi(gak)\phi \rangle| \\ &= a^{-2\rho} |\langle \tilde{\pi}(g^{-1})f, \tilde{\tau}(a) (\pi(k)\phi)(a^{-1}.aw) \rangle| \\ &\leq a^{-2\rho} \|\tau(a)\| |\langle \tilde{\pi}(g^{-1})f, (\pi(k)\phi)(a^{-1}.aw) \rangle|. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Since

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} (\pi(k)\phi)(a^{-1}.aw) \equiv (\pi(k)\phi)(w) \quad \text{in } C^\omega(N_0w, V_{\tilde{\tau}})$$

we see that the pairing in (14) defines a continuous function on the compact set $L \times (A_+ \cup \{\infty\}) \times K$ and is therefore uniformly bounded by some constant C . This finishes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

We continue the proof of Theorem 3.3. Let us assume for a moment that Γ is not cocompact, i.e., $F_\infty \neq \emptyset$. Then F can be covered by the sets

$$U_n := \{gaK \in X, gP \in \partial X \mid a_g^\alpha < n, gP \in F_\infty, a \in A_+\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus by compactness of F we can find a compact $L \subset G$ such that $LP = F_\infty$ and $F_G \subset LA_+K$. Since there are constants $C', d_1 > 0$ such that for $g \in L, a \in A_+$

$$a \leq C' a_{ga}, \quad a^{-2\rho} \|\tau(a)\| \leq a^{d_1}$$

Lemma 3.4 implies that

$$|c_{f_1, \phi}(g)| \leq C_1 a_g^{d_1} \quad \text{for all } g \in F_G.$$

Combining this with (13) we obtain

$$|c_{f, \phi}(g)| \leq C_0 a_g^{d_0} \quad \text{for all } g \in F_G.$$

Obviously, this inequality remains true in the cocompact case (with $d_0 = 0$). Since f is Γ -invariant, we have

$$c_{f, \phi}(\gamma g) = \varphi(\gamma) c_{f, \phi}(g).$$

We arrive at

$$|c_{f, \phi}(\gamma g)| \leq C a_\gamma^{\delta_\varphi + \varepsilon} a_g^{d_0} \quad \text{for all } g \in F_G, \gamma \in \Gamma.$$

Now by [21], Corollary 2.4, there is some C'' such that

$$a_\gamma a_g \leq C'' a_{\gamma g} \quad \text{for all } g \in F_G, \gamma \in \Gamma.$$

Setting $d_f = \max(d_0, \delta_\varphi + \varepsilon)$ we obtain

$$|c_{f, \phi}(g)| \leq C_{f, \phi} a_g^{d_f} \quad \text{for all } g \in G.$$

Thus $c_{f, \phi}$ has moderate growth which implies $f \in C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\tau, \varphi))$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.3. $\square$

Corollary 3.5 *If $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$, then ${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. If $\Omega \neq \emptyset$, then Theorem 4.7 in [21] states that for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = \{0\}.$$

This result can also be proved for cocompact Γ by a similar but much easier argument. The corollary now follows from Theorem 3.3. $\square$

From now on we assume $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. As a space of hyperfunction sections over a noncompact manifold $C^{-\omega}(\Omega, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ does not carry a natural topology. For this reason the continuity of res is not obvious. But the proof of the continuity in case of trivial σ and φ given in [19], Lemma 2.11, carries over to the general situation. Thus we have

Lemma 3.6 *The map*

$$res : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

is continuous.

We want to define ext_λ as the adjoint of a push-down map

$$\pi_{*, -\lambda} : C^\omega(\partial X, V(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi})) \rightarrow C^\omega(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi})) ,$$

which should be given by

$$\pi_{*, -\lambda}(f)(kM) = \sum_{g \in \Gamma} (\pi(g)f)(kM), \quad kM \in \Omega , \quad (15)$$

if the sum converges. Here we have used the identification

$$C^\omega(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi})) \cong {}^\Gamma C^\omega(\Omega, V(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi})) .$$

$\pi(g)$ is the action given by $\pi^{\tilde{\sigma}, -\lambda}(g) \otimes \tilde{\varphi}(g)$. In [21] it is shown that if we replace on both sides analytic by smooth sections, then $\pi_{*, -\lambda}$ converges for $\text{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$ and defines a holomorphic family of continuous maps in this half-plane. Adapting the proofs of [19], Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7, in a straightforward way to our more general situation we obtain

Lemma 3.7 *If $\text{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$, then the sum (15) converges and defines a continuous map*

$$\pi_{*, -\lambda} : C^\omega(\partial X, V(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi})) \rightarrow C^\omega(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi})) .$$

For any $g \in \Gamma$ it satisfies

$$\pi_{*, -\lambda} \circ \pi(g) = \pi_{*, -\lambda} . \quad (16)$$

Moreover, $\pi_{, -\lambda}$ depends holomorphically on λ .*

Definition 3.8 *For $\text{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$ we define the extension map*

$$ext_\lambda : C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

to be the adjoint of

$$\pi_{*, -\lambda} : C^\omega(\partial X, V(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi})) \rightarrow C^\omega(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi})) .$$

In fact, by Lemma 3.7 the extension exists, is continuous, and by [19], Lemma 2.3, it depends holomorphically on λ as an operator with values in $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. It follows from (16) that the range of ext_λ consists of Γ -invariant vectors. Moreover, the restriction of ext_λ to distribution sections coincides with the extension map

$$ext_\lambda : C^{-\infty}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

considered and shown to be meromorphic on $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ in [21].

Lemma 3.9 *For $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$ the extension map is the inverse of res :*

$$\operatorname{res} \circ \operatorname{ext}_\lambda = \operatorname{id} , \quad (17)$$

$$\operatorname{ext}_\lambda \circ \operatorname{res} = \operatorname{id} . \quad (18)$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.5 of [21] the relation (17) holds on the dense subspace $C^{-\infty}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \subset C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. It extends by continuity to the whole space of hyperfunction sections. It follows that

$$\operatorname{res} \circ \operatorname{ext}_\lambda \circ \operatorname{res} = \operatorname{res} .$$

Since by Corollary 3.5 the restriction map is injective for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$ this implies (18). $\square$

We want to construct a meromorphic continuation of $\operatorname{ext}_\lambda$ to all of $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$. For this reason we will study the scattering matrix acting on analytic sections. First we have to recall the Knapp-Stein intertwining operators.

Let $w \in N_K(\mathfrak{a}) \setminus M$ be a representative of the nontrivial element of the Weyl group $W(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a}) \cong N_K(\mathfrak{a})/M \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. If σ is a representation of M , then its Weyl-conjugate σ^w , acting on the same vector space V_σ , is defined by $\sigma^w(m) := \sigma(w^{-1}mw)$. If σ is equivalent to σ^w , then we say that σ is Weyl-invariant. Unless indicated otherwise σ shall from now on denote a Weyl-invariant representation of M which is either irreducible or of the form $\sigma' \oplus \sigma'^w$ with σ' irreducible and not Weyl-invariant. In both cases the representation of M on V_σ can be extended to a representation of $N_K(\mathfrak{a})$ which we also denote by σ . This extension is unique up to a character of the Weyl group, i.e., the two possible choices of $\sigma(w)$ can differ by a sign, only. Let us fix such an extension.

For $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < 0$ the (unnormalized) G -intertwining operator

$$\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} : C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_{-\lambda}))$$

is defined by the convergent integral

$$(\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} f)(g) := \sigma(w) \int_N f(gnw) \, dn . \quad (19)$$

Here we consider $f \in C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ as a function on G with values in V_{σ_λ} satisfying $f(gp) = \sigma_\lambda(p)^{-1} f(g)$ for all $p \in P$. The operator $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ does not depend on the choice of w . For $\sigma = \sigma' \oplus \sigma'^w$ as above we denote by $\hat{J}_{\sigma', \lambda}$ the restriction of $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ to $C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma'_\lambda))$.

The holomorphic family $\lambda \mapsto \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ has a meromorphic continuation to all of $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ with poles of at most first order. There is a meromorphic function $p_\sigma : \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, called the Plancherel density, such that

$$\hat{J}_{\sigma, -\lambda} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} = \frac{1}{p_\sigma(\lambda)} \operatorname{id} . \quad (20)$$

For all this see [45] or [69], Ch. 10. Since $C^\omega(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ is the space of analytic vectors of the continuous Fréchet representation $C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ the intertwining operator restricts to a

continuous operator

$$\hat{J}_{\sigma,\lambda} : C^\omega(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow C^\omega(\partial X, V(\sigma_{-\lambda})) .$$

The argument of the proof of [19], Lemma 2.16, shows that the latter operator indeed comes as a meromorphic family in the strong sense of this paper. The restriction of the adjoint of $\hat{J}_{\tilde{\sigma},\lambda}$ to $C^\omega(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ coincides with $\hat{J}_{\sigma,\lambda}$ ([45], Lemma 24). Therefore this adjoint can be used to define the continuous extension to hyperfunction sections

$$\hat{J}_{\sigma,\lambda} : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{-\lambda})) ,$$

which is again a meromorphic family of operators ([19], Lemma 2.3).

For any open $U \subset \partial X$ we introduce the space

$$C_U^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) := \{f \in C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \mid \text{res}_U f \in C^\omega(U, V(\sigma_\lambda))\} .$$

We equip $C_U^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ with the weakest topology such that the embedding $C_U^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \hookrightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ and the restrictions $C_U^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow C^\omega(W, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ to the spaces of germs of real analytic sections along any compact $W \subset U$ are continuous. We also consider the analogously defined twisted versions $C_U^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. The argument of the proof of [19], Lemma 2.19, shows that the intertwining operators are off-diagonally smoothing in the following strong sense.

Lemma 3.10 *For any open $U \subset \partial X$ the intertwining operators induce a meromorphic family of continuous operators*

$$\hat{J}_{\sigma,\lambda} : C_U^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow C_U^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{-\lambda})) .$$

Tensoring with a finite-dimensional representation (φ, V_φ) of Γ we obtain a meromorphic family of Γ -intertwining operators which we denote by the same symbol

$$\hat{J}_{\sigma,\lambda} := \hat{J}_{\sigma,\lambda} \otimes \text{id} : C_U^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C_U^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) .$$

Definition 3.11 *For $\text{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$ we define the unnormalized scattering matrix*

$$\hat{S}_{\sigma,\lambda} : C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi))$$

as the continuous operator given by the composition

$$\hat{S}_{\sigma,\lambda} := \text{res} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma,\lambda} \circ \text{ext}_\lambda .$$

From now on we assume $X \neq \mathbb{O}H^2$. Theorem 5.10 in [21] tells us that the restriction of the scattering matrix to smooth and distribution sections, respectively,

$$\hat{S}_{\sigma,\lambda} : C^{\pm\infty}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{\pm\infty}(B, V_B(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) \quad (21)$$

has a meromorphic continuation to all of $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$. We are now able to prove the corresponding statement in the analytic category.

Proposition 3.12 *The restriction of the scattering matrix (21) to $C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ provides a meromorphic family on $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ of continuous operators*

$$\hat{S}_{\sigma, \lambda} : C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) .$$

The meromorphic continuation of the scattering matrix acting on hyperfunctions, initially defined for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$, is given by the adjoint of

$$\hat{S}_{\tilde{\sigma}, \lambda} : C^\omega(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi})) \rightarrow C^\omega(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi})) . \quad (22)$$

We have

$$\hat{S}_{\sigma, -\lambda} \circ \hat{S}_{\sigma, \lambda} = \frac{1}{p_\sigma(\lambda)} \operatorname{id} . \quad (23)$$

Proof. [21], Theorem 5.10, asserts that the restriction of $\operatorname{ext}_\lambda$ to distribution sections has a meromorphic continuation to $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$. This together with (17) implies that

$$\operatorname{ext}_\lambda : C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C_\Omega^{-\omega}(\partial X, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

is meromorphic. Now

$$\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} : C_\Omega^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C_\Omega^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi))$$

is meromorphic by Lemma 3.10, while

$$\operatorname{res}_\Omega : C_\Omega^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^\omega(\Omega, V(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi))$$

is holomorphic by definition. We conclude the meromorphy of

$$\hat{S}_{\sigma, \lambda} = \operatorname{res} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} \circ \operatorname{ext}_\lambda : C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) .$$

The adjoint of (21) is given by

$$\hat{S}_{\tilde{\sigma}, \lambda} : C^{\mp\infty}(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi})) \rightarrow C^{\mp\infty}(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi}))$$

([21], Lemma 5.8). This implies that the adjoint of (22) indeed provides a meromorphic continuation of the scattering matrix as defined in Definition 3.11. Concerning the functional equation (23) we also could refer to [21], Theorem 5.10. However, it might be instructive to verify (23) directly. Note that (18) remains true on all of $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$, if we restrict both sides to $C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. Let us compute $\hat{S}_{\sigma, -\lambda} \circ \hat{S}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ on $C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$

$$\hat{S}_{\sigma, -\lambda} \circ \hat{S}_{\sigma, \lambda} = \operatorname{res} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, -\lambda} \circ \operatorname{ext}_{-\lambda} \circ \operatorname{res} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} \circ \operatorname{ext}_\lambda = \operatorname{res} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, -\lambda} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} \circ \operatorname{ext}_\lambda = \frac{1}{p_\sigma(\lambda)} \operatorname{id} .$$

Here we have also used (17) and (20). By meromorphy (23) holds on all of $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$. $\square$

We now come to the meromorphic continuation of $\operatorname{ext}_\lambda$. First we treat the case $\delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi < 0$.

Lemma 3.13 *If $\delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi < 0$, then*

$$ext_\lambda : C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) ,$$

initially defined for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$, admits a meromorphic continuation to all of $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^$ with at most finite-dimensional singularities.*

Proof. For $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < -(\delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi)$ we set

$$\widetilde{ext}_\lambda := p_\sigma(\lambda) \hat{J}_{\sigma, -\lambda} \circ ext_{-\lambda} \circ \hat{S}_{\sigma, \lambda} .$$

Using (18) and the functional equation (23) we obtain for $\operatorname{Re}(\pm\lambda) < -(\delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi)$

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{ext}_\lambda = ext_\lambda \circ res \circ \widetilde{ext}_\lambda &= p_\sigma(\lambda) ext_\lambda \circ res \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, -\lambda} \circ ext_{-\lambda} \circ \hat{S}_{\sigma, \lambda} \\ &= p_\sigma(\lambda) ext_\lambda \circ \hat{S}_{\sigma, -\lambda} \circ \hat{S}_{\sigma, \lambda} = ext_\lambda . \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\widetilde{ext}_\lambda$ provides a meromorphic continuation of ext_λ to all of $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$. Since ext_λ restricted to distribution sections has finite-dimensional singularities ([21], Theorem 5.10), and since distribution sections are dense in $C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ its continuous extension to hyperfunction sections has the same finite-dimensional singularities. $\square$

As in [19] and [21] we now apply the embedding trick in order to remove the assumption $\delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi < 0$.

Lemma 3.14 *If $\sigma = 1$ is the trivial representation of M , then Lemma 3.13 holds true without the assumption $\delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi < 0$.*

Proof. The proof is almost the same as the one of Lemma 5.13 in [21]. For the convenience of the reader we reproduce it here.

X belongs to a series of rank-one symmetric spaces. First we assume that G^n belongs to the list $\{Spin(1, n), SO(1, n)_0, SU(1, n), Sp(1, n)\}$. Then we have a sequence of real, semisimple, linear Lie groups $\dots \subset G^n \subset G^{n+1} \subset \dots$ inducing embeddings of the corresponding Iwasawa constituents $K^n \subset K^{n+1}$, $N^n \subset N^{n+1}$, $M^n \subset M^{n+1}$ such that $A = A^n = A^{n+1}$. Furthermore, there are totally geodesic embeddings of the symmetric spaces $X^n \subset X^{n+1}$ inducing embeddings of their boundaries $\partial X^n \subset \partial X^{n+1}$. If $\Gamma \subset G^n$ is convex cocompact, then it is still convex cocompact viewed as a subgroup of G^{n+1} . We obtain embeddings $\Omega^n \subset \Omega^{n+1}$ inducing $B^n \subset B^{n+1}$ while the limit set Λ^n is identified with Λ^{n+1} . Let $\rho^n(H) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}(\operatorname{ad}(H)|_{\mathfrak{n}^n})$, $H \in \mathfrak{a}$.

The exponent of Γ now depends on n and is denoted by δ_Γ^n . We have the relation $\delta_\Gamma^{n+1} = \delta_\Gamma^n - \zeta$, where $\zeta := \rho^{n+1} - \rho^n > 0$. Thus $\delta_\Gamma^{n+m} \rightarrow -\infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, taking m large enough we obtain $\delta_\Gamma^{n+m} + \delta_\varphi < 0$. The aim of the following discussion is to show how the meromorphic continuation of ext_λ^{n+1} leads to the continuation of ext_λ^n .

Let $P^n := M^n A^n N^n$, $V(1_\lambda, \varphi)^n := G^n \times_{P^n} V_{1_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi$, and $V_{B^n}(1_\lambda, \varphi) = \Gamma \backslash V(1_\lambda, \varphi)|_{\Omega^n}^n$. Here as always (φ, V_φ) is a finite-dimensional representation of Γ . The representation V_{1_λ} of P^{n+1} restricts to the representation $V_{1_{\lambda-\zeta}}$ of P^n . This induces isomorphisms of bundles

$$V(1_\lambda, \varphi)|_{\partial X^n}^{n+1} \cong V(1_{\lambda-\zeta}, \varphi)^n, \quad V_{B^{n+1}}(1_\lambda, \varphi)|_{B^n} \cong V_{B^n}(1_{\lambda-\zeta}, \varphi) .$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} i^* : C^\omega(B^{n+1}, V_{B^{n+1}}(1_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi})) &\rightarrow C^\omega(B^n, V_{B^n}(1_{\lambda-\zeta}, \tilde{\varphi})) , \\ j^* : C^\omega(\partial X^{n+1}, V(1_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi})^{n+1}) &\rightarrow C^\omega(\partial X^n, V(1_{\lambda-\zeta}, \tilde{\varphi})^n) \end{aligned}$$

denote the maps given by restriction of sections. Note that j^* is G^n -equivariant. The adjoint maps define the push-forward of hyperfunction sections

$$\begin{aligned} i_* : C^{-\omega}(B^n, V_{B^n}(1_\lambda, \varphi)) &\rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B^{n+1}, V_{B^{n+1}}(1_{\lambda-\zeta}, \varphi)) , \\ j_* : C^{-\omega}(\partial X^n, V(1_\lambda, \varphi)^n) &\rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X^{n+1}, V(1_{\lambda-\zeta}, \varphi)^{n+1}) . \end{aligned}$$

If $\phi \in C^{-\omega}(B^n, V_{B^n}(1_\lambda, \varphi))$, then the push forward $i_*\phi$ has support in $B^n \subset B^{n+1}$. Since $res^{n+1} \circ ext_\lambda^{n+1} = \text{id}$ we have

$$\text{supp}(ext_\lambda^{n+1} \circ i_*)(\phi) \subset \Lambda^{n+1} \cup \Omega^n = \partial X^n . \quad (24)$$

Assume that ext_λ^{n+1} is meromorphic on $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$. We are now going to continue ext_λ^n using i_* , $ext_{\lambda-\xi}^{n+1}$ and a left inverse of j_* . We identify $C^\omega(\partial X^{n+1}, V(1_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi})^{n+1})$ with $C^\omega(\partial X^{n+1}) \otimes V_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Denote by $\bar{B}(0, 1)$ the closed unit ball in $\mathbb{F}$, where $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{H}$, respectively. We choose an analytic diffeomorphism $T : \bar{B}(0, 1) \times \partial X^n \xrightarrow{\cong} U$ to a tubular neighborhood U of ∂X^n in ∂X^{n+1} . Then we define a continuous extension $t : C^\omega(\partial X^n) \otimes V_{\tilde{\varphi}} \rightarrow C^\omega(U) \otimes V_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ by

$$T^* t f(r, x) := f(x) .$$

Let $t' : C^{-\omega}(U, V(1_{\lambda-\zeta}, \varphi)^{n+1}) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X^n, V(1_\lambda, \varphi)^n)$ be the adjoint of t . Then $t' \circ j_* = \text{id}$. Because of (24) we can define

$$\widetilde{ext}_\lambda^n \phi := (t' \circ ext_{\lambda-\xi}^{n+1} \circ i_*)(\phi) .$$

Then

$$\widetilde{ext}_\lambda^n : C^{-\omega}(B^n, V_{B^n}(1_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X^n, V(1_\lambda, \varphi)^n)$$

is a meromorphic family on $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ of continuous maps with at most finite-dimensional singularities.

In order to prove that $\widetilde{ext}_\lambda^n$ provides the desired meromorphic continuation it remains to show that it coincides with ext_λ^n in the region $\text{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma^n + \delta_\varphi$. If $\text{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma^n + \delta_\varphi$, then $\text{Re}(\lambda) - \zeta > \delta_\Gamma^{n+1} + \delta_\varphi$, and the push-down maps $\pi_{*, -\lambda}^n$, $\pi_{*, -\lambda+\zeta}^{n+1}$ are defined. It is easy to see from the definition of the push-down that in the domain of convergence

$$i^* \circ \pi_{*, -\lambda+\xi}^{n+1} = \pi_{*, -\lambda}^n \circ j^* .$$

Taking adjoints we obtain $ext_{\lambda-\xi}^{n+1} \circ i_* = j_* \circ ext_{\lambda}^n$. Therefore we have

$$\widetilde{ext}_{\lambda}^n = t' \circ ext_{\lambda-\xi}^{n+1} \circ i_* = t' \circ j_* \circ ext_{\lambda}^n = ext_{\lambda}^n .$$

It follows by meromorphy that $\text{im}(\widetilde{ext}_{\lambda}^n)$ consists of Γ -invariant sections for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$.

If G^n does not belong to the list $\{Spin(1, n), SO(1, n)_0, SU(1, n), Sp(1, n)\}$, then there is a finite covering $p : \tilde{G}^n \rightarrow G^n$ with $\tilde{G}^n \in \{Spin(1, n), SO(1, n)_0, SU(1, n), Sp(1, n)\}$. In this case one can find a normal subgroup $\Gamma^0 \subset \Gamma$ of finite index and a discrete torsion-free subgroup $\tilde{\Gamma}^0 \subset \tilde{G}^n$ such that p induces an isomorphism from $\tilde{\Gamma}^0$ to Γ^0 . Indeed, using Selberg's Lemma (see e.g. [59]) we can take a torsion-free subgroup $\tilde{\Gamma}^0$ of $p^{-1}(\Gamma)$ of finite index and set $\Gamma^0 := p(\tilde{\Gamma}^0)$. We can apply the concept of embedding to the subgroup $\tilde{\Gamma}^0$. In order to transfer results for $\tilde{\Gamma}^0$ to Γ we use averages over the finite group Γ/Γ^0 . This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.14. $\square$

Now we are able to prove the main result of this section in full generality.

Theorem 3.15 *If $X \neq \mathbb{O}H^2$, then the extension map*

$$ext_{\lambda} : C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)) \rightarrow {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)) ,$$

initially defined for $\text{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_{\Gamma} + \delta_{\varphi}$, admits a meromorphic continuation to all of $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^$ with at most finite-dimensional singularities and satisfies*

$$res \circ ext_{\lambda} = \text{id} . \quad (25)$$

Proof. In view of Lemma 3.14 it is enough to reduce the statement to the case $\sigma = 1$. As in [21] we use tensoring with finite-dimensional G -representations. We can assume that σ is irreducible. Then there exists an irreducible finite-dimensional representation $\pi_{\sigma, \mu}$ of G with highest $\mathfrak{a}$ -weight $\mu \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ such that the representation of M on the highest weight space is equivalent to σ . The embedding of P -representations $\sigma_{\lambda} \hookrightarrow 1_{\lambda+\mu} \otimes \pi_{\sigma, \mu}$ induces a Γ -equivariant embedding of bundles

$$i_{\sigma, \mu} : V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) \hookrightarrow V(1_{\lambda+\mu}, \pi_{\sigma, \mu} \otimes \varphi) , \quad (26)$$

where we have used the Γ -equivariant isomorphism

$$V(\pi_{\sigma, \mu}|_P) \cong V(1_{\rho}, \pi_{\sigma, \mu}|_{\Gamma}) , \quad [g, v] \mapsto (gP, \pi_{\sigma, \mu}(g)v) .$$

Therefore we have the corresponding embedding of bundles over B

$$i_{\sigma, \mu}^B : V_B(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) \hookrightarrow V_B(1_{\lambda+\mu}, \pi_{\sigma, \mu} \otimes \varphi) .$$

These embeddings induce corresponding embeddings of the spaces of sections which we denote by the same symbols. One now checks that for $\text{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_{\Gamma} + \delta_{\varphi}$

$$ext_{\lambda+\mu} \circ i_{\sigma, \mu}^B = i_{\sigma, \mu} \circ ext_{\lambda} . \quad (27)$$

By Lemma 3.14 the left hand side of (27) is meromorphic on $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ with finite-dimensional singularities. This provides the meromorphic continuation of the right hand side, thus of ext_{λ} in general. For more details we refer to [21], pp. 108-109. Equation (25) now follows from (17) by meromorphy. This finishes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

Corollary 3.16 ${}^{\Gamma}C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ is dense in ${}^{\Gamma}C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$.

Proof. Choosing a holomorphic trivialization of the family of bundles

$$\bigcup_z V_B(\sigma_{\lambda+z\alpha}, \varphi)$$

we can identify $C^{-\omega}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ with the space of constant families $\mu \mapsto f_{\mu} \in C^{-\omega}(B, V(\sigma_{\mu}, \varphi))$. We set

$$W_{reg} := \{f \in C^{-\omega}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)) \mid ext_{\mu} f_{\mu} \text{ is regular at } \mu = \lambda\}.$$

Then $ext_{\lambda} : W_{reg} \rightarrow {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ is a well-defined continuous map. Since the singularity of ext_{μ} at $\mu = \lambda$ is at most finite-dimensional $W_{reg} \subset C^{-\omega}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ has finite codimension. Using that $C^{-\infty}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)) \subset C^{-\omega}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ is dense we can find a finite-dimensional subspace $W_{\infty} \subset C^{-\infty}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ such that

$$C^{-\omega}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)) = W_{reg} \oplus W_{\infty}. \quad (28)$$

Let now $f \in {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$. Choose a sequence $g_i \in C^{-\infty}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ converging to $g = res(f)$. We decompose g and g_i according to (28), $g = g^{reg} + g^{\infty}$, $g_i = g_i^{reg} + g_i^{\infty}$. Then $g^{\infty}, g_i^{\infty}, g_i^{reg} \in C^{-\infty}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$. We set

$$f_i = f - ext_{\lambda} g^{reg} + ext_{\lambda} g_i^{reg}.$$

Because of the continuity of ext_{λ} and of the splitting (28) the sequence f_i converges to f . Moreover,

$$res(f_i) = g^{\infty} + g_i^{reg} \in C^{-\infty}(B, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)).$$

Hence $f_i \in {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ by Theorem 3.3. This proves the corollary. $\square$

4 Invariant distributions on the limit set

This section can be considered as a variation on the theme of [21], Section 6. We retain the notation and assumptions of the previous section. Throughout this section we assume $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. For a given representation σ of M we now consider only such $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$, where ext_{λ} is meromorphic with an at most finite-dimensional singularity. By Theorem 3.15 this is the case for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ whenever $X \neq \mathbb{O}H^2$.

First we need the following result (compare [19], Proposition 3.4).

Proposition 4.1 *If $f \in {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ and $\phi \in {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tilde{\sigma}_{\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi}))$, then*

$$\langle res \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}(f), res(\phi) \rangle = 0 .$$

Note that $res \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}(f)$ is regular since it only sees the off-diagonal part of the intertwining operator. Moreover, $res \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}(f) \in C^{\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi))$ by Lemma 3.10. Thus the above pairing is well-defined.

Proof. According to [21], Proposition 6.5, the assertion is true for $f \in {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ and $\phi \in {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\tilde{\sigma}_{\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi}))$. Now $f \in {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi))$ by Theorem 3.3. Because of Lemma 3.6 and Corollary 3.16 the assertion extends to $\phi \in {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tilde{\sigma}_{\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi}))$ by continuity. $\square$

Next we introduce certain extensions of the bundles $V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)$ with themselves. Let Π be the space of polynomials on $\mathfrak{a}$. The group A acts on it by translations. This action extends to a representation $1^+ : MAN \rightarrow GL(\Pi)$ given by

$$1^+(man)f(H) := f(H - \log a) .$$

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the finite dimensional subspace Π^k of polynomials of degree at most $k - 1$ is invariant with respect to this action. We denote the restriction of 1^+ to Π^k by 1^k . Then we set $V^k(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) := V(\sigma_{\lambda} \otimes 1^k, \varphi)$, $V^+(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) := V(\sigma_{\lambda} \otimes 1^+, \varphi)$. There is a chain of inclusions

$$\begin{aligned} \{0\} = V^0(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) \subset V(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) &= V^1(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) \subset V^2(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) \subset \dots \\ \dots \subset V^k(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) \subset V^{k+1}(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) &\subset \dots \subset V^+(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi) . \end{aligned}$$

Again there is a restriction map between the corresponding spaces of sections

$$res : {}^{\Gamma}C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B^k(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)) , \quad \sharp \in \{\infty, \omega\} .$$

We are especially interested in the space of invariant sections supported on the limit set (recall Theorem 3.3)

$${}^{\Gamma}C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)) := \ker res .$$

We set

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\pm\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) &:= \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} C^{\pm\sharp}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) , \\ C^{\pm\sharp}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) &:= \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} C^{\pm\sharp}(B, V_B^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) . \end{aligned}$$

The space $C^\infty(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \subset C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ can be described as follows

$$\left\{ f : G \times \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow V_\sigma \otimes V_\varphi \mid \begin{array}{l} f \text{ smooth and polynomial w.r.t. } \mathfrak{a} , \\ f(gman, H) = a^{\lambda-\rho}(\sigma(m)^{-1} \otimes \text{id})f(g, H + \log a) \end{array} \right\} . \quad (29)$$

We view the short root α as a coordinate on $\mathfrak{a}$. Differentiation defines a P -equivariant operator

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} : \Pi \rightarrow \Pi .$$

It induces a Γ -equivariant bundle homomorphism

$$\varrho : V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \rightarrow V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$$

which maps $V^{k+1}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ onto $V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$. ϱ induces a kind of shift operators

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho : C^{\pm\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) &\rightarrow C^{\pm\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) , \\ \varrho_\Gamma : {}^\Gamma C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) &\rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) , \\ \varrho_B : C^{\pm\sharp}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) &\rightarrow C^{\pm\sharp}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) . \end{aligned}$$

Note that ϱ and ϱ_B are surjective while the possible failure of surjectivity of ϱ_Γ will turn out to have cohomological meaning (see Corollary 5.4). We also have the restriction map

$$res : {}^\Gamma C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

and its kernel ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. We obtain

$$res \circ \varrho_\Gamma = \varrho_B \circ res . \quad (30)$$

We denote the spaces of germs at λ of holomorphic and meromorphic families $\mu \mapsto f_\mu \in C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\mu, \varphi))$ and $\mu \mapsto f_\mu \in C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B(\sigma_\mu, \varphi))$ by $\mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi))$, $\mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi))$ and $\mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B(\sigma., \varphi))$, $\mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B(\sigma., \varphi))$, respectively. Let $\mathcal{M}_\lambda^k C^{-\sharp}(\dots)$ be the space of germs of meromorphic families which have a pole of order at most k at λ . Then

$$\mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi)) \subset \mathcal{M}_\lambda^k C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi)) \subset \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi))$$

become Γ -representations in a natural way. We consider the Γ -equivariant operator $L_\lambda : \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi)) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi))$ induced by $f_{\lambda+z\alpha} \mapsto z f_{\lambda+z\alpha}$.

Lemma 4.2 *There is a Γ -equivariant map*

$$ev : \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

given by

$$ev(f_\mu)(H) := \text{res}_{z=0}(e^{\langle z\alpha, H \rangle} f_{\lambda+z\alpha}) , \quad H \in \mathfrak{a} .$$

Here we consider f_μ as a family of generalized functions on G with values in $V_\sigma \otimes V_\varphi$ satisfying

$$f_\mu(\cdot p) = (\sigma_\mu(p)^{-1} \otimes \text{id}) f_\mu(\cdot) , \quad \forall p \in P .$$

ev induces isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{M}_\lambda^k C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi)) / \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi)) \cong C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) , \quad (31)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi)) / \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi)) \cong C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) . \quad (32)$$

We have

$$ev \circ L_\lambda = \varrho \circ ev . \quad (33)$$

The analogous statements for $C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\mu, \varphi))$ are also true.

Proof. First one checks that $ev(f_\mu)$ satisfies the correct transformation law (29) with respect to the right action of P . Then one observes that (31) is true for $k = 1$. Indeed, the preimage $ev^{-1}(f)$ of $f \in C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \cong C^{-\sharp}(K \times_M V_\sigma) \otimes V_\varphi$ in $\mathcal{M}_\lambda^1 C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi)) / \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi))$ is given by $\lambda + z\alpha \mapsto \frac{1}{z} f \in C^{-\sharp}(K \times_M V_\sigma) \otimes V_\varphi \cong C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda+z\alpha}, \varphi))$. In order to complete the proof of the lemma it suffices to show (33). Let $H_0 \in \mathfrak{a}$ be the element determined by $\langle \alpha, H_0 \rangle = 1$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} ev(L_\lambda f_\mu)(rH_0) &= \text{res}_{z=0}(e^{zr} z f_{\lambda+z\alpha}) = \text{res}_{z=0}\left(\frac{d}{dr} e^{rz} f_{\lambda+z\alpha}\right) \\ &= \frac{d}{dr} ev(f_\mu)(rH_0) = \varrho(ev(f_\mu))(rH_0) . \end{aligned}$$

□

In view of (33) the map ev can be considered as a version of taking the principal part of the Laurent expansion of a meromorphic family $f_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma., \varphi))$ in a Γ -equivariant way.

For l sufficiently large we are now able to define a pointwise shifted extension map

$$ext[l] : C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) , \quad \sharp \in \{\infty, \omega\} .$$

Definition 4.3 By $k_- = k_-(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we denote the order of the pole of ext_μ at $\mu = \lambda$. Let $f \in C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. We write $f = ev(f_\mu)$ for some $f_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B(\sigma., \varphi))$. For $l \geq k_-$ we define

$$ext[l](f) := ev(ext_\mu(L_\lambda^l f_\mu)) \in C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) .$$

If $f_\mu \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))$, then $\text{ext}_\mu(L_\lambda^l f_\mu) \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))$. Therefore the analog of (32) for B shows that $\text{ext}[l]$ is well-defined on $C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\mu, \varphi))$. Moreover, $\text{ext}[l]$ maps $C^{-\sharp}(B, V_B^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ to ${}^\Gamma C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$.

Equation (25) now implies that

$$\text{res} \circ \text{ext}[l] = \varrho_B^l . \quad (34)$$

Moreover, for $l \geq k_-$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we have by (33)

$$\text{ext}[l+r] = \varrho_\Gamma^r \circ \text{ext}[l] = \text{ext}[l] \circ \varrho_B^r . \quad (35)$$

Since ϱ_B^r is surjective (35) implies that $\text{im } \text{ext}[l]$ does not depend on the choice of $l \geq k_-$.

Definition 4.4 *We form*

$$\begin{aligned} E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) &:= \text{ext}[l] \left(C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) , \\ E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) &:= E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \cap {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \end{aligned}$$

for some $l \geq k_-(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$.

Lemma 4.5 *The space $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ is finite-dimensional, and we have for any $l \geq k_-$*

$$E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = \text{ext}[l] \left(C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^l(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k_-}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) .$$

Proof. By (34) we have for $f \in C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$

$$\text{res} \circ \text{ext}[l](f) = \varrho_B^l(f) .$$

Thus $\text{ext}[l](f) \in \ker \text{res}$ if and only if $f \in C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^l(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. We conclude that

$$E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = \text{ext}[l] \left(C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^l(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) .$$

Hence the space $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ can be considered as the space of principal parts of Laurent expansions at $\mu = \lambda$ of families of the form

$$\mu \mapsto \text{ext}_\mu f_\mu , \quad f_\mu \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi)) .$$

Since the singularity of ext_μ at $\mu = \lambda$ is finite-dimensional we therefore see that $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ is finite-dimensional. Using in addition that $C^{-\infty}(B, V_B^l(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \subset C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^l(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is dense we conclude that

$$E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = \text{ext}[k_-] \left(C^{-\infty}(B, V_B^{k_-}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k_-}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) .$$

□

We choose a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t}$ of $\mathfrak{m}$. Then $\mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{a} =: \mathfrak{h}$ is a Cartan algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. We consider the center $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ of the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Via the Harish-Chandra isomorphism characters of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ are parametrized by elements of $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}^*/W(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})$, where $W(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})$ is the Weyl group of $(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})$. We choose a positive root system Δ^+ of $(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})$ such that all roots with positive restriction to $\mathfrak{a}$ are positive. A character χ_{ν} , $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$, is called integral, if

$$2 \frac{\langle \nu, \varepsilon \rangle}{\langle \varepsilon, \varepsilon \rangle} \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (36)$$

for all $\varepsilon \in \Delta^+$. Here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is a $W(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})$ -invariant bilinear scalar product on $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$.

By $\rho_{\mathfrak{m}} \in i\mathfrak{t}^* \subset \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ we denote half of the sum of the positive $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{C}}$ -roots. Let $\hat{M}$ be the set of equivalence classes of irreducible representations of M . For $\sigma \in \hat{M}$ let $\mu_{\sigma} \in i\mathfrak{t}^*$ be its highest weight. The infinitesimal character of the principal series representation $\pi^{\sigma, \lambda}$ of G , $\sigma \in \hat{M}$, $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$, is now given by $\chi_{\sigma, \lambda} := \chi_{\mu_{\sigma} + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} - \lambda}$. If $X \neq \mathbb{R}H^2$, then we define for $\sigma \in \hat{M}$

$$I_{\sigma} := \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}^* \mid \chi_{\sigma, \lambda} \text{ is integral}\} .$$

If $X = \mathbb{R}H^2$ and $G = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, then $M \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Let ± 1 denote the trivial (+), resp. non-trivial (-) irreducible representation of M . We define

$$I_1 := (\frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z})\alpha, \quad I_{-1} := \mathbb{Z}\alpha .$$

If $G = PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$, then $M = \{1\}$, and we define $I_1 := (\frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z})\alpha$. Note that $I_{\sigma^w} = I_{\sigma}$, so the definition is compatible with our previous convention concerning the Weyl-invariance of σ . Let $I_{\mathfrak{a}} \subset \mathfrak{a}^*$ be the lattice generated by the short root α , if 2α is a root, or by $\alpha/2$, if not. Note that $I_{\sigma} \subset I_{\mathfrak{a}}$. More precisely, we have either $I_{\sigma} = 2I_{\mathfrak{a}}$ or $I_{\sigma} = \alpha' + 2I_{\mathfrak{a}}$, where α' denotes the generator of $I_{\mathfrak{a}}$.

A character χ_{ν} is called regular, if none of the expressions (36) vanishes. We call it weakly regular, if it is regular or if $X \neq \mathbb{R}H^n$ and (36) vanishes for at most one positive root ε . We set

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\sigma}^r &:= \{\lambda \in I_{\sigma} \mid \chi_{\sigma, \lambda} \text{ is regular}\} , \\ I_{\sigma}^{wr} &:= \{\lambda \in I_{\sigma} \mid \chi_{\sigma, \lambda} \text{ is weakly regular}\} . \end{aligned}$$

Note that $I_{\sigma} \setminus I_{\sigma}^r$ is finite.

We need the following irreducibility criterion for the principal series representations $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda}))$. Compare related results in [64], [4], [25].

Lemma 4.6 *Let σ be irreducible, $\lambda \neq 0$. If $\lambda \notin I_{\sigma}^{wr}$, then $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda}))$ is irreducible. Assume in addition that $X \neq \mathbb{R}H^{2n+1}$ or that $p_{\sigma}(0) = 0$. Then for all $\lambda \in I_{\sigma}^r$ the representation $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\lambda}))$ is reducible.*

Proof. For $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) = 0$, $\lambda \neq 0$, the irreducibility of $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ is well-known (see e.g. [44], Prop. 7.2). Thus we can assume that $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \neq 0$. For $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > 0$ ($\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < 0$) there is a unique nonzero irreducible G -submodule (quotient) of $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ which is given by the image of $\hat{J}_{\sigma^w, -\lambda}$ (of $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$) (see e.g. [44], Prop. 7.24). (By a G -submodule we always mean a representation on a closed subspace.) In particular, $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ is irreducible if and only if $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{-\lambda}^w))$ is, and this holds precisely if $\hat{J}_{\sigma^w, -\lambda}$ is surjective. Since $\hat{J}_{\sigma^w, -\lambda}$ is always regular and the poles of $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ are of at most first order the functional equation (20) now leads to following irreducibility criterion:

Let $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > 0$. Then $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ (and $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{-\lambda}^w))$) is irreducible if and only if both $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ and $p_\sigma(\lambda)$ are regular or $p_\sigma(\lambda) = 0$.

The poles of $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ are always contained in $I_\mathfrak{a}$ ([45], Thm. 3 and Prop. 43). In addition, for the real hyperbolic spaces one knows that they are contained $I_\mathfrak{a} \setminus I_\sigma$ in case of even dimension and in I_σ in case of odd dimension. For a $SO(2n-1)$ -representation σ this follows from [45], Proposition 44. In any case, simple invariance considerations imply that the residue of $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \mu}$, which is a differential operator, vanishes at the remaining points of $I_\mathfrak{a}$.

The Plancherel densities p_σ are explicitly known (see e.g. [44], Prop. 14.26):

$$p_\sigma(\lambda) = c(\sigma) \begin{cases} \prod_{\varepsilon \in \Delta^+} \frac{\langle \mu_\sigma + \rho_\mathfrak{m} - \lambda, \varepsilon \rangle}{\langle \varepsilon, \varepsilon \rangle}, & X = \mathbb{R}H^{2n+1} \\ \tan \left(d\pi \frac{\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} \right) \prod_{\varepsilon \in \Delta^+} \frac{\langle \mu_\sigma + \rho_\mathfrak{m} - \lambda, \varepsilon \rangle}{\langle \varepsilon, \varepsilon \rangle}, & X \neq \mathbb{R}H^{2n+1}, \quad 0 \notin I_\sigma \\ \cot \left(d\pi \frac{\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} \right) \prod_{\varepsilon \in \Delta^+} \frac{\langle \mu_\sigma + \rho_\mathfrak{m} - \lambda, \varepsilon \rangle}{\langle \varepsilon, \varepsilon \rangle}, & X \neq \mathbb{R}H^{2n+1}, \quad 0 \in I_\sigma \end{cases}, \quad (37)$$

where $d = 1$ for real hyperbolic spaces, $d = \frac{1}{2}$ else, and $c(\sigma)$ is a positive constant depending on the normalization of the Haar measure dn .

An easy discussion of the poles and zeroes of p_σ now shows that the above irreducibility criterion implies the first assertion of the lemma.

If $X \neq \mathbb{R}H^{2n+1}$, then p_σ has poles at all $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$. Thus in this case $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ is reducible. For $X = \mathbb{R}H^{2n+1}$ and $p_\sigma(0) = 0$ the intertwining operator $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ has poles at all nonnegative $\lambda \in I_\sigma$ ([45], Proposition 44). If, in addition, $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$, then $p_\sigma(\lambda) \neq 0$. Thus by the above irreducibility criterion $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ is reducible. This finishes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

One can show in addition, that for $X = \mathbb{C}H^n$ the intertwining operator $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ has a pole at all positive $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr} \setminus I_\sigma^r$. By definition, we have $I_\sigma^{wr} = I_\sigma^r$ for $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$. Thus for real and complex hyperbolic spaces and $p_\sigma(0) = 0$ the representations $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ are reducible for all non-zero $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr}$. However, for $X = \mathbb{H}H^n$ or $\mathbb{O}H^2$ there are some exceptional pairs (σ, λ) with $p_\sigma(0) = 0$, $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr}$, and $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ irreducible (see [4], [3]).

We now introduce a certain subset $I_\sigma^{wr, -} \subset I_\sigma^{wr}$ by

$$I_\sigma^{wr, -} := \{ \lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr} \mid \text{there exist } \sigma' \in \hat{M}, \lambda' > \lambda \text{ s.t. } \chi_{\sigma', \lambda'} = \chi_{\sigma, \lambda} \}.$$

Definition 4.7 We call a pair (σ, λ) *special*, if it satisfies one of the following conditions:

1. $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$ and $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr, -}$.
2. $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < 0$ and $\lambda \in I_{\mathfrak{a}}$.

A pair (σ, λ) is called *very special* if $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr, -}$.

Recall that $I_\sigma^{wr, -} \subset I_\sigma \subset I_{\mathfrak{a}}$. Therefore a very special pair is special. The following lemma provides some basic information on the set $I_\sigma^{wr, -}$. We set $\mathfrak{a}_\pm^* := \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}^* \mid \pm \lambda \geq 0\}$.

Lemma 4.8 1. Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}^*$. If $\nu = \mu_\sigma + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + \lambda$ belongs to the closed positive Weyl chamber, i.e., all the scalar products in (36) are non-negative, then $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr, -}$. Under the additional assumption $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$ also the opposite implication is true.

2. The set $I_\sigma^{wr, -} \cap \mathfrak{a}_+^*$ is finite.
3. $I_\sigma^{wr} \cap \mathfrak{a}_-^* \subset I_\sigma^{wr, -}$.
4. If $\sigma = 1$ is the trivial representation, then $I_\sigma^{wr, -} \cap \mathfrak{a}_+^* = \emptyset$. In other words: If $\sigma = 1$ and $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$, then (σ, λ) is not special. The same is true for $\sigma = -1$ in case $G = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$.

Proof. Assume that $\nu = \mu_\sigma + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + \lambda$ belongs to the closed positive Weyl chamber. Let (σ', λ') be such that $\chi_{\sigma', \lambda'} = \chi_{\sigma, \lambda}$. Then $\mu_{\sigma'} + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} - \lambda' = w(\mu_\sigma + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} - \lambda)$ for some $w \in W(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})$, hence

$$w^\theta(\nu) = \mu_{\sigma'} + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + \lambda',$$

where θ is the Cartan involution and $w^\theta := \theta \circ w \circ \theta$. Since ν belongs to the positive Weyl chamber the difference $\nu - w\nu$ is a non-negative linear combination of positive roots. Positive roots have non-negative restrictions to $\mathfrak{a}$. It follows that $\lambda - \lambda' = (\nu - w\nu)|_{\mathfrak{a}} \geq 0$, hence $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr, -}$. Vice versa, assume that $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r \setminus I_\sigma^{wr, -}$. Define ν as above. Let ν_0 be the Weyl conjugate of ν which belongs to the positive chamber. The condition $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$ implies that $\nu_0 = \mu_{\sigma'} + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + \lambda'$ for some pair (σ', λ') . Since $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr, -}$ we have $0 \geq \lambda' - \lambda = (\nu_0 - \nu)|_{\mathfrak{a}}$. Since $\nu_0 - \nu$ is a non-negative linear combination of positive roots, we conclude that $\lambda' = \lambda$ and $\tau := \nu_0 - \nu$ is a non-negative linear combination of positive $\mathfrak{m}$ -roots. It follows that

$$\|\mu_\sigma\|^2 = \|\mu_{\sigma'}\|^2 = \|\mu_\sigma + \tau\|^2 = \|\mu_\sigma\|^2 + \|\tau\|^2 + 2\langle \mu_\sigma, \tau \rangle \geq \|\mu_\sigma\|^2 + \|\tau\|^2.$$

We conclude that $\tau = 0$, hence $\nu = \nu_0$, i.e., ν belongs to the positive chamber. This finishes the proof of the Assertion 1.

Fix σ . Then there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ such that for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ the element $\mu_\sigma + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + \lambda$ belongs to the positive Weyl chamber. Assertion 1 now implies that $I_\sigma^{wr, -} \cap \mathfrak{a}_+^*$ is contained in the finite set $[0, \lambda_0) \cap I_\sigma$. This proves 2.

Let $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr} \cap \mathfrak{a}_-^*$. If $\lambda < 0$, then $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr,-}$, since $\chi_{\sigma^w, -\lambda} = \chi_{\sigma, \lambda}$. Here w denotes the non-trivial element of the small Weyl group $W(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a})$. In order to prove Assertion 3 it remains to discuss the case $\lambda = 0$. If $0 \in I_\sigma^r$, then there exists $\varepsilon \in \Delta^+$ such that $\langle \varepsilon, \mu_\sigma + \rho \rangle < 0$. Hence $0 \in I_\sigma^{wr,-}$ by Assertion 1. If $0 \in I_\sigma^{wr} \setminus I_\sigma^r$, then $X \neq \mathbb{R}H^n$ and $\langle \mu_\sigma + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}}, \varepsilon \rangle = 0$ if and only if ε is the real root, i.e., $\varepsilon|_{\mathfrak{t}} = 0$. A case by case check shows that there exists an element $w \in W(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})$ such that $w\varepsilon \neq \pm\varepsilon$ and $w\varepsilon|_{\mathfrak{a}} \neq 0$, i.e., $w\varepsilon$ is not a root of $\mathfrak{m}$. This implies that $w(\mu_\sigma + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}})|_{\mathfrak{a}} \neq 0$ and that $w(\mu_\sigma + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}})|_{\mathfrak{t}}$ is $\mathfrak{m}$ -regular. Therefore we can find an element $w_1 \in W(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})$ which commutes with θ such that $w_1 w(\mu_\sigma + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \mu_{\sigma'} + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} - \lambda'$ for some $\sigma' \in \hat{M}$, $\lambda' > 0$. Thus $0 \in I_\sigma^{wr,-}$.

We now prove 4. Let $\lambda \in I_1^{wr,-}$. Then $\|\lambda\|^2 + \|\rho_{\mathfrak{m}}\|^2 = \|\mu_{\sigma'} + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}}\|^2 + \|\lambda'\|^2$ for some pair (σ', λ') with $\lambda' > \lambda$. Now $\|\mu_{\sigma'} + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}}\|^2 \geq \|\rho_{\mathfrak{m}}\|^2$ implies $\|\lambda'\|^2 \leq \|\lambda\|^2$. It follows that $\lambda < 0$. The same argument applies to the case $G = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, $\sigma = -1$. $\square$

The relevance of Definition 4.7 becomes manifest by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.9 *Assume that (σ, λ) is not special. Then*

$$\text{res} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} : {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi))$$

is injective.

Proof. If we replace the condition $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr,-}$ in Definition 4.7 by $\lambda \in I_\sigma$, then the assertion is covered by Corollary 6.8 in [21]. The proof of this statement in [21] rests on Lemma 6.7 of that paper which asserts that under certain conditions on (σ, λ) for $0 \neq f \in C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ the sections f and $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} f$ cannot vanish simultaneously on the same open subset of ∂X . In particular, it is shown there for arbitrary (σ, λ) that if there exists $f \in C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ having this vanishing property, then there are an integer $m > 0$, a representation $\sigma' \in \hat{M}$, and a nontrivial G -intertwining operator

$$D : C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma'_{\lambda+m\alpha})) \rightarrow C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) . \quad (38)$$

Thus it remains to show that this cannot happen for $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr,-}$, $\text{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$.

Indeed, if such an operator exists, then $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma'_{\lambda+m\alpha}))$ has the same infinitesimal character as $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$. By the very definition of $I_\sigma^{wr,-}$ this is impossible for $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr} \setminus I_\sigma^{wr,-}$. Assume now that $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$. Then $\lambda + m\alpha \notin I_{\sigma'}^{wr}$. Since $\text{Re}(\lambda + m\alpha) > 0$ it follows from Lemma 4.6 that $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma'_{\lambda+m\alpha}))$ is irreducible. Thus the image of D is isomorphic to the irreducible non-tempered representation $I_{-\infty}^{\sigma', \lambda+m\alpha}$. This is impossible by Langlands classification (see e.g. [68], Thm. 5.4.1): Since $I_{-\infty}^{\sigma', \lambda+m\alpha}$ is non-tempered it follows that $\text{Re}(\lambda) > 0$, and for $\text{Re}(\lambda) > 0$, $\text{Re}(\lambda') > 0$, the equivalence $I_{-\infty}^{\sigma, \lambda} \cong I_{-\infty}^{\sigma', \lambda'}$ implies $\sigma = \sigma'$, $\lambda = \lambda'$. This finishes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 4.10 *Let σ be irreducible, $\lambda \neq 0$, and let $I \subset C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ be a proper G -submodule. If $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \cap {}^\Gamma(I \otimes V_\varphi)$, then $\text{res} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}(f) = 0$.*

Proof. The same argument which ensures the existence of the operator (38) in the proof of Lemma 6.7 in [21] shows that any $0 \neq f \in I \subset C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ vanishing on some open $U \subset \partial X$ gives rise to an intertwining operator $D : C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow I$ which is nonzero whenever $(\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda} f)|_U \neq 0$. If $\text{Re}(\lambda) > 0$ ($\text{Re}(\lambda) < 0$), then the G -module $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ has a unique irreducible submodule (quotient), which, in addition, is not equivalent to any other subquotient of $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$, whereas it is irreducible for $\text{Re}(\lambda) = 0, \lambda \neq 0$ (see e.g. [44], Theorem 7.2, Theorem 7.24, and Theorem 8.61). Thus there cannot exist a non-zero intertwining operator $D : C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow I$. The lemma follows. $\square$

In many situations, e.g. for $\text{Re}(\lambda) < 0$, Lemma 4.10 has a much simpler proof. Indeed, in this case $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ is regular and vanishes identically on each proper submodule. However, such a simple argument does not work if $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \mu}$ has a pole at $\mu = \lambda$.

The following proposition can be considered as a refinement of [21], Proposition 6.11.

Proposition 4.11 *If (σ, λ) is not special, then*

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) .$$

In particular, in this case we have

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k-}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) .$$

Proof. We set

$$\begin{aligned} E^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) &:= E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \cap {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) , \\ E_\Lambda^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) &:= E^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \cap E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) . \end{aligned}$$

We consider the restriction map

$$\text{res}_1 : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) .$$

The first step in the proof is to show the inequality $\dim E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \geq \dim \text{coker } \text{res}_1$, which is more or less obvious if ext_μ has a pole of at most first order at $\mu = \lambda$. The general case is more involved. For non-special (σ, λ) we will conclude equality and ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = E^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$. We then proceed by induction on k .

For some $l \geq k_-$ we form the space

$$B_\Lambda := C^{-\omega}(B, V^l(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) / \ker \text{ext}[l] .$$

Note that because of (34) indeed $\ker \text{ext}[l] \subset C^{-\omega}(B, V^l(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. Then by Lemma 4.5 the map $\text{ext}[l]$ induces an isomorphism

$$e_\Lambda : B_\Lambda \rightarrow E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$$

satisfying

$$\varrho_\Gamma \circ e_\Lambda = e_\Lambda \circ [\varrho_B] ,$$

where $[\varrho_B] : B_\Lambda \rightarrow B_\Lambda$ is induced by ϱ_B . Then $E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \cong \ker [\varrho_B]$. We claim that

$$\varrho_B^{l-1}(\ker \text{ext}[l]) = \text{res}_1(E^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \subset \text{im res}_1 . \quad (39)$$

Indeed, let $\phi \in \ker \text{ext}[l]$ and choose $\psi \in C^{-\omega}(B, V^{l+1}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ such that $\varrho_B(\psi) = \phi$. Then $\varrho_\Gamma \circ \text{ext}[l](\psi) = \text{ext}[l] \circ \varrho_B(\psi) = 0$, hence $\text{ext}[l](\psi) \in E^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$, and $\text{res}_1 \circ \text{ext}[l](\psi) = \varrho_B^{l-1}(\phi)$. Vice versa, if $\text{ext}[l](\psi) \in E^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$, then $\varrho_B(\psi) \in \ker \text{ext}[l]$, and $\text{res}_1 \circ \text{ext}[l](\psi) = \varrho_B^{l-1}(\varrho_B(\psi))$. This proves (39).

Now (39) implies that $[\varrho_B]^{l-1}$ induces a surjective map from $\text{coker} [\varrho_B]$ onto coker res_1 . Summarizing the above discussion we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d := \dim E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) &= \dim \ker [\varrho_B] \\ &= \dim \text{coker} [\varrho_B] \geq \dim \text{coker res}_1 . \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Set $\tilde{d} := \dim E_\Lambda^1(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi})$. If (σ, λ) is non-special, then so is $(\tilde{\sigma}, \lambda)$. Thus Proposition 4.1 combined with Corollary 4.9 implies

$$\dim \text{coker res}_1 \geq \dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi})) .$$

It follows that

$$d \geq \dim \text{coker}(res_1) \geq \dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi})) \geq \tilde{d} .$$

Changing the roles of (σ, φ) and $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\varphi})$ we obtain $d = \tilde{d} = \dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$, i.e.,

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) . \quad (41)$$

Moreover, we conclude equality in (40), hence in (39). This together with (41) implies

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = E^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) .$$

Let us assume in addition that

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^{k-1}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = E^{k-1}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) ,$$

and let $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. Then we can choose $\psi \in C^{-\omega}(B, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ such that $\varrho_\Gamma(f) = \text{ext}[l](\varrho_B(\psi))$. This implies $\varrho_\Gamma(f - \text{ext}[l](\psi)) = 0$. Thus

$$f - \text{ext}[l](\psi) \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = E^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) .$$

Hence $f \in E^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$. The proposition now follows by induction. $\square$

Now it is easy to derive the following

Proposition 4.12 *For any pair (σ, λ) the sequence of inclusions*

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \subset \dots \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k+1}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \subset \dots$$

stabilizes at some $k =: k_+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$, and ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k_+}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is finite-dimensional.

Proof. We can assume that σ is irreducible. Then there exist finite-dimensional G -representations $\pi_{\sigma, \mu}$ satisfying (26) and having arbitrary large highest weight $\mu \geq 0$. We choose one such that $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) + \mu \geq 0$. By Lemma 4.8 the pair $(1, \lambda + \mu)$ is not special. The embedding (26) can be continued to the extended bundles. We obtain by Proposition 4.11

$$i_{\sigma, \mu}({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(1_{\lambda+\mu}, \varphi \otimes \pi_{\sigma, \mu})) = E_\Lambda^+(1_{\lambda+\mu}, \varphi \otimes \pi_{\sigma, \mu}) .$$

The proposition now follows since the space on the right hand side is finite-dimensional by Lemma 4.5. $\square$

The assertion of Proposition 4.11 also holds for all pairs (σ, λ) which are not very special. In order to prove this we first make a couple of observations which are interesting in their own right.

Corollary 4.13 *For fixed σ and φ the set $\{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \mid {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \neq \{0\}\}$ is a discrete subset of the half-plane $\{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \mid \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \leq \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi\}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.11 we have

$$\{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \mid {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \neq \{0\}\} \subset \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \mid \operatorname{ext}_\mu \text{ has a pole at } \mu = \lambda \text{ or } (\sigma, \lambda) \text{ is special}\} .$$

By the meromorphy of ext_μ the set on the right hand side is discrete.

If $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \setminus {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k-1}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$, then $\varrho_\Gamma^{k-1} f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \setminus \{0\}$. Hence ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \neq \{0\}$ if and only if ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \neq \{0\}$. Thus by Corollary 3.5 we have $\{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \mid {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \neq \{0\}\} \subset \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \mid \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \leq \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi\}$. This finishes the proof of the corollary. $\square$

Corollary 4.14 *For $f_\mu \in {}^\Gamma \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))$ we have $\operatorname{ext}_\mu \circ \operatorname{res}(f_\mu) = f_\mu$.*

Proof. We consider $h_\mu := \operatorname{ext}_\mu \circ \operatorname{res}(f_\mu) - f_\mu$. By (25) we have $\operatorname{res}(h_\mu) = 0$. Hence h_μ is a Γ -invariant family which is supported on the limit set. Corollary 4.13 now implies that $h_\mu = 0$. $\square$

We can now give an alternative description of the space $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$.

Corollary 4.15 $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = \text{ev} \left({}^\Gamma \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi)) \right)$.

Proof. Let $f \in E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$. Then by definition of $\text{ext}[l]$, $l \geq k_-(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$, and $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ there exists a family $h_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))$ such that $f = \text{ev}(\text{ext}_\mu(L_\lambda^l h_\mu))$. This shows $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \subset \text{ev} \left({}^\Gamma \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi)) \right)$. The opposite inclusion follows from Corollary 4.14. Indeed, let $f_\mu \in {}^\Gamma \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))$ and $h_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))$ such that $L_\lambda^l h_\mu = \text{res}(f_\mu)$. Then

$$\text{ev}(f_\mu) = \text{ev}(\text{ext}_\mu \circ \text{res}(f_\mu)) = \text{ev}(\text{ext}_\mu(L_\lambda^l h_\mu)) = \text{ext}[l](\text{ev}(h_\mu)) \in E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) .$$

□

Proposition 4.16 *If (σ, λ) is not very special, then the assertions of Proposition 4.11 hold true.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.11 we can assume that (σ, λ) is special, but not very special. This in particular implies that $\text{Re}(\lambda) < 0$, hence $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}$ is regular, and $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$. By Lemma 4.6 the principal series representations $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma'_\mu))$ are irreducible for each of the (at most two) irreducible components σ' of σ and μ in a small neighbourhood of λ . Thus the intertwining operators $\hat{J}_{\sigma, \mu}$ are regular and bijective for μ near λ , hence induce isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{J} : \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi)) &\rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{-\lambda} C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi)) , \\ \hat{J} : \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi)) &\rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-\lambda} C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi)) , \\ \hat{J}_+ : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) &\rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) \end{aligned}$$

satisfying $\hat{J}_+ \circ \text{ev} = -\text{ev} \circ \hat{J}$. Now $-\lambda \notin I_\sigma$, thus $(\sigma, -\lambda)$ is not special. We conclude from Proposition 4.11 and Corollary 4.15 that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{J}_+ \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) &= {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) = E^+(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi) \\ &= \text{ev} \left(\hat{J}(\mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))) \right) \\ &= \hat{J}_+ \left(\text{ev}(\mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))) \right) \\ &= \hat{J}_+ (E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) . \end{aligned}$$

We obtain ${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$. This proves the proposition. □

We now use Proposition 4.11 and Corollaries 4.14 and 4.15 in order to generalize Proposition 4.1 to the extended bundles. We introduce a pairing between $C^\omega(B, V_B^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ and $C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^k(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}, \tilde{\varphi}))$ by

$$\langle \text{ev}(f_\mu), \text{ev}(g_\nu) \rangle_k := \text{res}_{z=0} \langle f_{\lambda+z\alpha}, (L_{-\lambda}^k g)_{-\lambda-z\alpha} \rangle ,$$

$f_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\lambda^k C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma., \varphi))$, $g_\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{-\lambda}^k C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}., \varphi))$. It is easily checked that this pairing is well-defined and non-degenerate. Since

$$res_\Omega \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \mu} : \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma., \varphi)) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{-\lambda} C^\omega(\Omega, V_B(\sigma., \varphi))$$

maps germs of holomorphic families to germs of holomorphic families (see the remark following Proposition 4.1) it induces as in Proposition 4.16 an operator

$$(res_\Omega \circ \hat{J})_+ : C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^\omega(\Omega, V^+(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi))$$

and thus an operator

$$(res \circ \hat{J})_+ : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^\omega(B, V_B^+(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) .$$

Note that we have to use families $f_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma., \varphi))$ which cannot be Γ -invariant (see Corollary 4.13) in order to define $(res \circ \hat{J})_+$. However, if $\hat{J}_\mu$ is regular at $\mu = \lambda$, then $(res \circ \hat{J})_+ = res \circ \hat{J}_+$.

Proposition 4.17 *If $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ and k is such that*

$$(res \circ \hat{J})_+(f) \in C^\omega(B, V_B^k(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) ,$$

then

$$\langle (res \circ \hat{J})_+(f), res(\phi) \rangle_k = 0$$

for all $\phi \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi}))$.

Proof. First we derive a formula for $(res \circ \hat{J})_+(f)$ assuming that $f \in E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$. Let D_λ be the residue of $\hat{J}_\mu$ at $\mu = \lambda$. It is a differential operator and thus induces a differential operator

$$D_\lambda^B : C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) \subset C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi)) .$$

Choose $f_\mu \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma., \varphi))$ such that $f = ev(ext_\mu f_\mu)$. We claim that

$$(res \circ \hat{J})_+(f) = D_\lambda^B f_\lambda - ev(\hat{S}_\mu f_\mu) . \quad (42)$$

Let $\tilde{f}_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma., \varphi))$ such that $ev(\tilde{f}_\mu) = f = ev(ext_\mu f_\mu)$, in other words

$$\tilde{f}_\mu - ext_\mu f_\mu \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma., \varphi)) .$$

Using that $\hat{J}_\mu$ has a pole of at most first order at $\mu = \lambda$ we compute

$$ev(res \circ \hat{J}_\mu(\tilde{f}_\mu - ext_\mu f_\mu)) = res \circ D_\lambda(\tilde{f}_\mu - ext_\mu f_\mu)|_{\mu=\lambda} = -D_\lambda^B f_\lambda .$$

Now we derive (42) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (res \circ \hat{J})_+(f) &= -ev(res \circ \hat{J}_\mu(\tilde{f}_\mu)) \\ &= D_\lambda^B f_\lambda - ev(res \circ \hat{J}_\mu(ext_\mu f_\mu)) \\ &= D_\lambda^B f_\lambda - ev(\hat{S}_\mu f_\mu) . \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 4.12 we consider an embedding

$$i_{\sigma,\mu} : V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \hookrightarrow V(1_{\lambda+\mu}, \pi_{\sigma,\mu} \otimes \varphi) ,$$

μ such that $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) + \mu \geq 0$ (if σ is the sum of two irreducible Weyl-conjugate representations, then also $\pi_{\sigma,\mu}$ is the sum of two irreducible G -representations having the same highest $\mathfrak{a}$ -weight μ). There is a corresponding embedding on the dual side

$$i_{\tilde{\sigma},\mu} : V(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi) \hookrightarrow V(1_{\lambda+\mu}, \pi_{\tilde{\sigma},\mu} \otimes \tilde{\varphi}) .$$

Now standard identities for intertwining operators imply (see the proof of Proposition 6.5 in [21], p. 116)

$$\langle (res \circ \hat{J})_+(f), res(\phi) \rangle_k = \langle (res \circ \hat{J})_+ \circ i_{\sigma,\mu}(f), res \circ i_{\tilde{\sigma},\mu}(\phi) \rangle_k .$$

Therefore it is enough to prove the proposition for non-special pairs like $(1, \lambda + \mu)$. We can thus assume $f \in E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$, $\phi \in E^k(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi)$.

Since $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ is finite-dimensional we can choose $\tilde{f}_\mu \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda C^\omega(B, V_B(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. Then $D_\lambda^B f_\lambda$ and $ev(\hat{S}_\mu f_\mu)$ are analytic sections. Write $\phi = ev(ext_\mu \psi_\mu)$ for some $\psi_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi}))$. Using the adjointness relation (22) for the scattering matrix we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle ev(\hat{S}_\mu f_\mu), res(\phi) \rangle_k &= \operatorname{res}_{z=0} \langle \hat{S}_{\lambda-z\alpha}(f_{\lambda-z\alpha}), (L_\lambda^k \psi)_{\lambda-z\alpha} \rangle \\ &= \operatorname{res}_{z=0} \langle f_{\lambda-z\alpha}, \hat{S}_{\lambda-z\alpha}(L_\lambda^k \psi)_{\lambda-z\alpha} \rangle \\ &= \operatorname{res}_{z=0} \langle f_{\lambda-z\alpha}, res \circ \hat{J}_{\lambda-z\alpha}(L_\lambda^k \circ ext(\psi))_{\lambda-z\alpha} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Since $\phi \in E^k(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi)$ all families appearing in the last line except $\hat{J}_{\lambda-z\alpha}$ are regular at $z = 0$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle ev(\hat{S}_\mu f_\mu), res(\phi) \rangle_k &= \langle f_\lambda, res \circ D_\lambda \circ \varrho_\Gamma^{k-1}(\phi) \rangle \\ &= \langle f_\lambda, D_\lambda^B \circ \varrho_B^{k-1}(res(\phi)) \rangle \\ &= \langle D_\lambda^B f_\lambda, \varrho_B^{k-1}(res(\phi)) \rangle . \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $f \in C^\omega(B, V_B^1(\sigma_{-\lambda}, \varphi))$, $g \in C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^k(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \tilde{\varphi}))$ we have

$$\langle f, g \rangle_k = \langle f, \varrho_B^{k-1}(g) \rangle .$$

We conclude that

$$\langle ev(\hat{S}_\mu f_\mu), res(\phi) \rangle_k = \langle D_\lambda^B f_\lambda, res(\phi) \rangle_k .$$

This together with (42) implies the proposition. $\square$

There is a characterization of $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ which is slightly weaker than Corollary 4.15 (but strong enough to imply Propositions 4.16 and 4.17, too). Recall the definition of $k_+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ from Proposition 4.12.

Lemma 4.18 *For any $k \geq k_+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ one has*

$$E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = \operatorname{im} \varrho_\Gamma^k .$$

Proof. It follows from (35) and the surjectivity of ϱ_B^k that $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \subset \text{im} \varrho_\Gamma^k$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We have to show that for $k \geq k_+$

$$\text{im} \varrho_\Gamma^k \subset E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) . \quad (43)$$

Let $f = \varrho_\Gamma^k(\tilde{f})$ for some $\tilde{f} \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. Let $l \geq k_-$, and choose $\psi \in C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ such that $\varrho_B^l(\psi) = \text{res}(\tilde{f})$. Using (34) we compute

$$\text{res}(\tilde{f} - \text{ext}[l](\psi)) = \varrho_B^l(\psi) - \varrho_B^l(\psi) = 0 .$$

Hence $\tilde{f} - \text{ext}[l](\psi)$ is supported on the limit set. It is therefore contained in the kernel of ϱ_Γ^k . Thus by (35)

$$f = \varrho_\Gamma^k(\tilde{f}) = \varrho_\Gamma^k(\text{ext}[l](\psi)) = \text{ext}[l](\varrho_B^k(\psi)) \in E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) .$$

This shows (43), and hence the lemma. $\square$

For $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ we will see in Section 8 (see also Corollary 5.4) that $\text{im} \varrho_\Gamma^k = \text{im} \varrho_\Gamma$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, hence $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = \text{im} \varrho_\Gamma$. It seems to be likely that this holds in general.

For the rest of this section we assume that $\text{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$ and that φ is unitary, which in particular implies $\delta_\varphi = 0$. In this case much more information on the spaces ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is available. We recall the following definition from [21], Chapter 7.

Definition 4.19 *For $\text{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$ we define the space of "stable" invariant distributions supported on the limit set as*

$$U_\Lambda(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) := \{f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \mid \text{res} \circ \hat{J}_{\sigma, \lambda}(f) = 0\} .$$

By Lemma 4.9 the space $U_\Lambda(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ can be nontrivial only if $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr, -}$. For irreducible σ and $\text{Re}(\lambda) > 0$ we denote by $I^{\sigma, \lambda}$ the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module of the unique irreducible submodule $I_\infty^{\sigma, \lambda}$ of the principal series representation $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$. We now restate some of the results of [21].

Proposition 4.20 *We have*

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \oplus U_\Lambda(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) , \quad (44)$$

$$E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) . \quad (45)$$

If ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is nonzero, then $\lambda \in [0, \delta_\Gamma] \subset \mathfrak{a}^$ and, for $\text{Re}(\lambda) > 0$ and σ irreducible, the $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module $I^{\sigma, \lambda}$ is unitarizable. The latter condition implies $p_\sigma(0) = 0$.*

Proof. Since ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \neq \{0\}$ if and only if ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \neq \{0\}$ (see the proof of Corollary 4.13) the proposition is a combination of a part of the statements of Lemma

7.2, Propositions 7.3, 7.4, 7.6, and Proposition 9.2 in [21]. $\square$

For $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > 0$ we can show in addition

Proposition 4.21 *Let σ be irreducible and $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > 0$. Then*

1. ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \subset {}^\Gamma(I_{-\omega}^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes V_\varphi)$.
2. *If $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ is reducible, then*

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = U_\Lambda(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) . \quad (46)$$

In particular, ext is regular at all $\lambda > 0$, $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$.

Proof. Let $I_{-\omega}^{\sigma, \lambda}$ be the closure of $I_{-\infty}^{\sigma, \lambda}$ in $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$. We claim that $I_{-\omega}^{\sigma, \lambda}$ is the only nonzero irreducible G -submodule of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$. For this we consider the action of the shifted Casimir operator $\Omega_\lambda := \Omega - \chi_{\sigma, \lambda}(\Omega) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$. One has $\chi_{\mu_\sigma + \rho_m - \mu}(\Omega) = \langle \mu, \mu \rangle - |\rho|^2 + |\mu_\sigma + \rho_m|^2 - |\rho_m|^2$. Thus Ω_λ acts on $\mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ as multiplication by $\langle \mu, \mu \rangle - \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle$, i.e. as $2\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle L_\lambda + |\alpha|^2 L_\lambda^2$. We conclude from (33) that Ω_λ acts on $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$ by

$$2\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle \varrho + |\alpha|^2 \varrho^2 . \quad (47)$$

Let $f \in C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda)) \setminus C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^{k-1}(\sigma_\lambda))$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then by (47) the element $\Omega_\lambda^{k-1} f$ belongs to $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_\lambda)) \setminus \{0\}$. It follows that any nonzero submodule $I \subset C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$ has nonzero intersection with $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_\lambda))$. This implies the claim.

We can now argue as in the proof of [21], Proposition 9.4. Let W be the dual representation of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda))$ (it is isomorphic to $C^\omega(\partial X, V^k(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}))$). Let $L \subset G$ be a compact set such that $gP \in \Omega$ for all $g \in L$, $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ and $\phi \in W$. Then Lemma 3.4 provides a constant C such that for all $a \in A_+$

$$|c_{f, \phi}(gak)| \leq C(\alpha(\log a))^{k-1} a^{-(\lambda + \rho)} .$$

This implies that $c_{f, \cdot}$ induces an intertwining operator from W to the unitary G -representation

$$L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) := \{f : G \rightarrow V_\varphi \mid f(gx) = \varphi(g)f(x) \ \forall g \in \Gamma, x \in G, \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} |f(x)|^2 dx < \infty\} .$$

By unitarity the image of $c_{f, \cdot}$ decomposes into a direct sum of irreducible representations. But by the above W has the unique irreducible quotient $W/(I_{-\omega}^{\sigma, \lambda})^\perp$. Thus $c_{f, \cdot}$ factorizes over this quotient, and hence $f \in {}^\Gamma(I_{-\omega}^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes V_\varphi)$. This finishes the proof of assertion 1.

The equality (46) for reducible principal series representations follows from Assertion 1 and Lemma 4.10. Principal series representations with regular integral infinitesimal character and

$p_\sigma(0) = 0$ are reducible by Lemma 4.6. If $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$, then (46) remains true by the vanishing result ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = \{0\}$ of Proposition 4.20. The regularity of ext_λ at these points now follows from (44). This finishes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

One knows that $\delta_\Gamma \leq \rho$, where equality holds iff $\Omega = \emptyset$. By the theory of the Patterson-Sullivan measure one always has

$$\dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(1_{\delta_\Gamma})) = 1. \quad (48)$$

If $\delta_\Gamma > 0$, this together with Proposition 4.20 implies that I^{1, δ_Γ} is unitarizable. For $X = \mathbb{H}H^n$, $n \geq 2$, and $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$ this gives nontrivial restrictions on the possible values of δ_Γ , an observation first made by Corlette [26]: If $\Omega \neq \emptyset$, then $\delta_\Gamma \leq \rho - \beta$, where $\beta := 2\alpha$ for $X = \mathbb{H}H^n$ and $\beta := 6\alpha$ for $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$. Using now Proposition 4.21 we are able to sharpen this result.

Corollary 4.22 *Let $\Gamma \subset G$ be a convex cocompact non-cocompact discrete subgroup, where $G = Sp(1, n)$, $Sp(1, n)/\mathbb{Z}_2$ or F_4^{-20} , then $\delta_\Gamma < \rho - \beta$.*

Proof. In any case, $\rho - \beta$ is the end of the spherical complementary series of G , hence $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(1_{\rho-\beta}))$ is reducible. This result goes back to Kostant [46] (see also [36], Ch. VI, Thm. 3.6). Proposition 4.21, 2 now says that ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(1_{\rho-\beta})) = U_\Lambda(1_{\rho-\beta}, 1)$, whereas $U_\Lambda(1_{\rho-\beta}, 1) = \{0\}$ by Lemma 4.8, 4, and Lemma 4.9. It follows from (48) that $\delta_\Gamma \neq \rho - \beta$. Note that we have not used the meromorphy of ext_λ in the above argument, thus it also works for the case $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$. $\square$

It remains to discuss the point $\lambda = 0$.

Proposition 4.23 *We have*

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_0, \varphi)) = {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_0, \varphi)), \quad (49)$$

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_0, \varphi)) = \begin{cases} E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_0, \varphi) & p_\sigma(0) = 0 \\ U_\Lambda(\sigma_0, \varphi) & p_\sigma(0) \neq 0 \end{cases}. \quad (50)$$

In particular, if $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$, then $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_0, \varphi) = \{0\}$. For $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ we have in addition

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_0, \varphi)) = U_\Lambda(\sigma_0, \varphi) = \{0\} \quad (51)$$

whenever σ is a faithful representation of $Spin(n-1)$.

Proof. It was shown in [21], Prop. 7.4, that ext_λ is regular at $\lambda = 0$, whenever $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$. If $p_\sigma(0) = 0$, then the explicit expression (37) for p_σ implies that $0 \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$. It follows that in this case $U_\Lambda(\sigma_0, \varphi) = \{0\}$. Equation (50) is now a consequence of (44). For $p_\sigma(0) = 0$ Equation

(49) follows from (45). The vanishing statement (51) follows from the observation that in the case in question $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$ and $0 \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$.

It remains to prove (49) for $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$. Fix $k > 1$, and let W be the dual representation of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0))$ (it is isomorphic to $C^\omega(\partial X, V^k(\tilde{\sigma}_0))$). As in the proof of Proposition 4.21 it is sufficient to show the following two assertions

- (i) Let $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_0, \varphi))$, $\phi \in W$. Then the matrix coefficient $c_{f,\phi}$ is square integrable.
- (ii) All irreducible G -submodules of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0))$ are contained in $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_0))$.

Let $L \subset G$ be a compact set such that $gP \in \Omega$ for all $g \in L$, $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_0, \varphi))$ and $\phi \in W$. Let $\hat{J}_k$ be the restriction of $\hat{J}_+$ (see the proof of Proposition 4.16) to $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \tilde{\varphi}))$. As in [21], Lemma 6.2, (compare also (14)) one shows that for $a \rightarrow \infty$

$$c_{f,\phi}(gak) = \langle (\hat{J}_k f)(ga), \tilde{\sigma}(w)\phi(k^{-1}w) \rangle_{V_\sigma} + O(a^{-\rho-\varepsilon}). \quad (52)$$

Since $p_{\tilde{\sigma}}(0) = p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$, the family ext_λ is regular at $\lambda = 0$, and the restriction map

$$res : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \tilde{\varphi})) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^k(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \tilde{\varphi}))$$

is surjective. Thus Proposition 4.17 yields $res \circ \hat{J}_k(f) = 0$. Now (52) implies Assertion (i).

The G -representation $Y := C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_0))$ decomposes into a direct sum of (two) irreducible representations. Any irreducible composition factor of $Y^k := C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0))$ is isomorphic to one of these. Thus any irreducible submodule of Y^k is the image of an intertwining operator $I \in \text{Hom}_G(Y, Y^k) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}, K}(Y_K, Y_K^k) \cong \text{Hom}_{MA}(Y_K/\mathfrak{n}Y_K, V_{\sigma_\rho} \otimes \Pi^k)$. Here the subscript K stands for the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module. The latter isomorphism is Casselman's Frobenius reciprocity ([68], 4.2.2). For $f \in Y_K$, $\phi \in W_K$ the matrix coefficients $c_{f,\phi}$ satisfy for $a \rightarrow \infty$

$$c_{f,\phi}(a) = p_{f,\phi} a^{-\rho} + O(a^{-\rho-\varepsilon}),$$

where $p_{f,\phi}$ is a constant not depending on a (see e.g. [21], Lemma 9.1 and Lemma 6.2). The main theorem in [35] identifies the generalized ρ -eigenspace of $\mathfrak{a}$ in $Y_K/\mathfrak{n}Y_K$ with the collection of functionals $p_{f,\cdot}$ on W_K . It follows that $\mathfrak{a}$ acts on it by scalars. This implies that the image of I^F is contained in $V_{\sigma_\rho} \subset V_{\sigma_\rho} \otimes \Pi^k$, where $I^F \in \text{Hom}_{MA}(Y_K/\mathfrak{n}Y_K, V_{\sigma_\rho} \otimes \Pi^k)$ corresponds to I by Frobenius reciprocity. Therefore the image of I is contained in Y . Assertion (ii) follows. $\square$

We conclude this section by making the results of the preceding three propositions more explicit for the case $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$. If $\sigma \in \hat{M}$ is a faithful representation of $Spin(n-1)$, then none of the $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules $I^{\sigma, \lambda}$, $\text{Re}(\lambda) > 0$, is unitarizable ([45], Proposition 53). If $\sigma \in \hat{M}$ factorizes over $SO(n-1)$, then in standard coordinates of it^* it has highest weight

$$\mu_\sigma = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{[\frac{n-1}{2}]}) , \quad m_i \in \mathbb{Z} ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &\geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_{\frac{n-2}{2}} \geq 0, & n \text{ even}, \\ m_1 &\geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_{\frac{n-3}{2}} \geq |m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}|, & n \text{ odd}. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\lambda_\sigma := \rho - (\max\{i \mid m_i \neq 0\})\alpha \in [0, \rho] \cap I_\sigma^r.$$

This maximum is understood to be zero for $\mu_\sigma = 0$. Then $C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$, $\text{Re}(\lambda) > 0$, is irreducible and unitarizable if and only if $0 < \lambda < \lambda_\sigma$. The representations $C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ with λ belonging to this interval are called representations of the complementary series. The only additional unitarizable Langlands submodule is $I^{\sigma, \lambda_\sigma}$, if $\lambda_\sigma > 0$ ([45], Propositions 45, 49, 50). Thus we obtain

Proposition 4.24 *Let $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, $\text{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$, σ irreducible, and φ be unitary. If σ is a faithful representation of $\text{Spin}(n-1)$, then*

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = \{0\}.$$

If σ factorizes over $SO(n-1)$, then

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = \begin{cases} E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) & 0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_\sigma, \lambda \leq \delta_\Gamma \\ U_\Lambda(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) & 0 \leq \lambda = \lambda_\sigma \leq \delta_\Gamma \\ \{0\} & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

5 Cohomology of real hyperbolic manifolds

We retain the notation and assumptions of the previous two sections. In addition, we assume that $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, in particular $Y = \Gamma \backslash X$ is a hyperbolic manifold of infinite volume and without cusps.

Any finite-dimensional representation φ of Γ defines a flat vector bundle $E(\varphi) := \Gamma \backslash (X \times V_\varphi)$ over Y . Here Γ acts diagonally on $X \times V_\varphi$. Using the results of Section 2 we want to relate the cohomology groups $H^p(Y, E(\varphi))$ with spaces of invariant distributions on the limit set studied in the previous section. Since X is contractible $H^p(Y, E(\varphi))$ is isomorphic to the group cohomology $H^p(\Gamma, V_\varphi)$ of Γ with coefficients in V_φ . The latter can be defined as the p -th right derived functor of the left exact functor $V_\varphi \mapsto {}^\Gamma V_\varphi$ from the category of Γ -modules to the category of abelian groups.

We have $\Gamma \subset G$, where G is $SO(1, n)_0$ or its double cover $Spin(1, n)$. Therefore we have maps $K \rightarrow SO(n)$, $M \rightarrow SO(n-1)$, which are either isomorphisms or double covers. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ be the Cartan decomposition. There is a natural action of K on $\mathfrak{p}_\mathbb{C}^*$ (it is equivalent to the standard representation of $SO(n)$). Note that $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{p}$. Let $\mathfrak{a}^\perp \subset \mathfrak{p}_\mathbb{C}^*$ be its annihilator. We have representations γ^p of K on $V_{\gamma^p} := \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}_\mathbb{C}^*$ and σ^p of M on $V_{\sigma^p} := \Lambda^p \mathfrak{a}^\perp$. The embedding $T : \mathfrak{a}^\perp \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{p}_\mathbb{C}^*$ induces M -equivariant embeddings $T_p := \Lambda^p T \in \text{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma^p}, V_{\gamma^p})$, $p = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. As G -homogeneous vector bundles we have

$$\Lambda^p T_\mathbb{C}^* X = G \times_K V_{\gamma^p}, \quad \Lambda^p T_\mathbb{C}^*(\partial X) = V(\sigma_{\rho-p\alpha}^p).$$

Thus as G -representations $\Omega^p(X) = C^\infty(G, V_{\gamma^p})^K$, $\Omega^p(\partial X) = C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\rho-p\alpha}^p))$, $\Omega_{-\omega}^p(\partial X) = C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{\rho-p\alpha}^p))$. Here $\Omega_{-\omega}^p(\partial X)$ denotes the space of p -hyperforms on ∂X , i.e., differential forms with hyperfunction coefficients. In addition, we are interested in the Γ -module

$$\Omega_{-\infty}^p(\Lambda) = C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_{\rho-p\alpha}^p))$$

of currents supported on the limit set.

Let τ be a finite-dimensional representation of $P = MAN$, $T \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\tau, V_{\gamma^p})$. Then one defines a G -equivariant map, called Poisson transform,

$$P_\tau^T : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tau)) \rightarrow C^\infty(G, V_{\gamma^p})^K = \Omega^p(X)$$

by

$$P_\tau^T f(g) := \int_K \gamma^p(k) T f(gk) dk \in V_{\gamma^p}. \quad (53)$$

The integral is a formal notation meaning that the hyperfunction $\gamma^p(\cdot) T f(g \cdot)$ on K has to be applied to the constant function 1.

For $p \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ we first consider the following Poisson transforms

$$P_{p,\lambda} := P_{\sigma_\lambda^p}^{T_p} : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow \Omega^p(X).$$

$P_{p,\lambda}$ coincides with the Poisson transform $P_\lambda^{T_p}$ considered in [21]. Moreover, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have $P_{p,z\alpha} = \Phi_p^{\frac{n-1}{2}-z}$, where Φ_p^z is the transform introduced and investigated in detail by Gaillard in [30].

We choose a G -invariant Riemannian metric on X . It is unique up to a constant factor. We will remember this factor by the induced length of $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}^* \subset \mathfrak{p}^* \cong T_{eK}^*X$. The metric of constant sectional curvature -1 corresponds to $|\alpha| = 1$. The Riemannian metric induces p -form Laplacians Δ .

We say that a differential form $h \in C^\infty(G, V_{\gamma^p})^K = \Omega^p(X)$ has moderate growth if there are constants $C, d \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ such that for all $g \in G$

$$|h(g)| \leq C a_g^d.$$

Let $\Omega_{mg}^p(X) \subset \Omega^p(X)$ be the subspace of forms having moderate growth. We can now summarize the main results of [30] by the following theorem. Compare also the discussion in [39].

Theorem 5.1 (Gaillard [30]) *The Poisson transforms $P_{p,\lambda}$ define equivariant mappings between the following G -representations*

$$P_{p,\lambda} : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda^p)) \rightarrow \{\omega \in \Omega^p(X) \mid \Delta\omega = (\langle \rho - p\alpha, \rho - p\alpha \rangle - \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle)\omega, \delta\omega = 0\}, \quad (54)$$

$$P_{p,\lambda} : C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda^p)) \rightarrow \{\omega \in \Omega_{mg}^p(X) \mid \Delta\omega = (\langle \rho - p\alpha, \rho - p\alpha \rangle - \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle)\omega, \delta\omega = 0\}. \quad (55)$$

(54) and (55) are isomorphisms if and only if $\lambda \notin \{-\rho + p\alpha\} \cup -\rho - \mathbb{N}\alpha$. In particular, if $p \neq \frac{n-1}{2}$, then

$$P_{p,\rho-p\alpha} : \Omega_{-\omega}^p(\partial X) \rightarrow \Omega^p(X)_{\Delta,\delta}$$

is an isomorphism (see Section 2 for notation). Moreover,

$$(n-1-p)dP_{p,\rho-p\alpha} = (n-1-2p)P_{p+1,\rho-(p+1)\alpha}d, \quad p \leq n-2, \quad (56)$$

$$dP_{n-1,-\rho}f = \left(\int_{\partial X} f\right)(1-n)\frac{\text{vol}_X}{|\alpha|^n}, \quad (57)$$

$$P_{p+1,\rho-(p+1)\alpha}d = \frac{p}{|\alpha|} * P_{p,\rho-p\alpha}*, \quad p = \frac{n-1}{2}, \quad (58)$$

where vol_X denotes the volume form of $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ with respect to the chosen normalization of the G -invariant metric and $*$ denotes the Hodge star operator on X and ∂X , respectively.

Note that the star operator on X depends on the invariant metric on X , while the star operator on ∂X in the middle dimension is conformally invariant.

Tensoring with V_φ and restricting to Γ -invariants $P_{p,\rho-p\alpha} \otimes \text{id}_{V_\varphi}$ induces a map

$$P_{p,\rho-p\alpha} : \Gamma(\Omega_{-\omega}^p(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E(\varphi))_{\hat{\Delta}, \hat{\delta}},$$

which is an isomorphism for $p \neq \frac{n-1}{2}$. Taking (56) and (57) into account (note that vol_X spans the one-dimensional space $\Omega^n(X)_{\Delta, \delta}$) we see that in the case of even dimension suitably normalized Poisson transforms provide an isomorphism between the complexes

$$0 \rightarrow \Gamma(\Omega_{-\omega}^0(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \xrightarrow{d} \Gamma(\Omega_{-\omega}^1(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \xrightarrow{d} \dots \xrightarrow{d} \Gamma(\Omega_{-\omega}^{n-1}(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \xrightarrow{\int_{\partial X}} \Gamma V_\varphi \rightarrow 0 \quad (59)$$

and $(\Omega^*(Y, E(\varphi))_{\hat{\Delta}, \hat{\delta}}, d)$. It now follows from Theorem 2.7 that (59) computes the cohomology groups $H^p(Y, E(\varphi))$. Note, however, that for non-cocompact Γ all spaces appearing in (59) except ΓV_φ are infinite-dimensional ([21], Corollary 9.7). In order to get something finite-dimensional we want to reduce things to currents supported on the limit set using the operators ext_λ . Such a reduction process is not compatible with (59) (see, however, Subsection 7.2 for the relation the subcomplex of (59) consisting of currents supported on the limit set to cohomology with compact support). We will therefore use the description of cohomology given in Proposition 2.8 instead of the one given in Theorem 2.7. To do this have to describe the spaces $Z^p(Y, E(\varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}$ as images of suitably defined Poisson transforms.

For odd n we first need a bijective transform into harmonic forms also for $p = \frac{n-1}{2}$. There is a decomposition $\sigma^{\frac{n-1}{2}} = \sigma^+ \oplus \sigma^-$ into the $\pm i(-i)^{\frac{n-3}{2}}$ -eigenspaces of the star operator. Then

$$C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_0^\pm)) = \Omega_{-\omega}^\pm(\partial X) := \{\omega \in \Omega_{-\omega}^{\frac{n-1}{2}}(\partial X) \mid * \omega = \pm i(-i)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \omega\}.$$

Let $i^\pm : \sigma^\pm \rightarrow \sigma^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ be the corresponding embedding and $T^\pm = T^{\frac{n-1}{2}} i^\pm \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\sigma^\pm, V_{\gamma^{\frac{n-1}{2}}})$. Set

$$P_{\pm, \lambda} := P_{\sigma_\lambda^\pm}^{T^\pm} = P_{\frac{n-1}{2}, \lambda|_{C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda^\pm))}}.$$

Corollary 5.2 *We have*

$$P_{\pm, \lambda} : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda^\pm)) \rightarrow \{\omega \in \Omega_{-\omega}^{\frac{n-1}{2}}(X) \mid * d\omega = \pm i(-i)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \langle \lambda, \frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rangle \omega, \delta\omega = 0\}, \quad (60)$$

$$P_{\pm, \lambda} : C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda^\pm)) \rightarrow \{\omega \in \Omega_{m_g}^{\frac{n-1}{2}}(X) \mid * d\omega = \pm i(-i)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \langle \lambda, \frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rangle \omega, \delta\omega = 0\}. \quad (61)$$

(60) and (61) are isomorphisms for $\lambda \notin -\rho - \mathbb{N}\alpha$. In particular,

$$P_{\pm, 0} : \Omega_{-\omega}^\pm(\partial X) \rightarrow \ker d \cap \ker \delta \subset \Omega^{\frac{n-1}{2}}(X)$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. One can identify $V_{\sigma^p} = \Lambda^p \mathfrak{n}_\mathbb{C}^*$, $X = NA$, and, using NA -invariant forms, $\Omega^p(X) = C^\infty(NA) \otimes \Lambda^p(\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \oplus \mathfrak{n}_\mathbb{C}^*)$. Let $\omega_p \in \Lambda^p \mathfrak{n}_\mathbb{C}^*$, and $\delta_{\omega_p} \in C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda^p))$ be the corresponding delta distribution at $eM \in K/M = \partial X$. Then $P_{p, \lambda} \delta_{\omega_p}(na) = a^{\lambda+\rho} \omega_p$, and one easily computes

$$*d(a^{\lambda+\rho} \omega_p) = \langle \lambda + \rho - p\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|} \rangle a^{\lambda+\rho} *_{\sigma^p} \omega_p.$$

Since the delta distributions at eM with values in $V_{\sigma^\pm}$ generate the G -representation $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda^\pm))$ it follows that the image of $P_{\pm, \lambda}$ is contained in the eigenspace appearing in (60). In addition, since $(*d)^2 = (-1)^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \delta d$ we see that for $p = \frac{n-1}{2}$, $\lambda \neq 0$ the right hand side of (54) is the direct sum of the two eigenspaces appearing in (60). Thus for $\lambda \neq 0$ the corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.1.

For the case $\lambda = 0$ we observe that the Hodge decomposition $\Omega^{\frac{n-1}{2}}(\partial X) = \text{im } d \oplus \text{im } *d$ implies that $d : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_0^\pm)) \rightarrow \ker D_{\frac{n+1}{2}} \subset \Omega^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(\partial X)$ is bijective, where $D_{\frac{n+1}{2}} = d$ for $n > 3$ and $D_{\frac{n+1}{2}} = \int_{\partial X}$ for $n = 3$. By Theorem 5.1 including (56) and (57) the Poisson transform $P_{\frac{n+1}{2}, -\alpha}$ provides an isomorphism between $\ker D_{\frac{n+1}{2}}$ and $\ker d \cap \ker \delta \subset \Omega^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(X)$. Now (58) shows that $P_{\pm, 0}$ is an isomorphism. $\square$

Now we want to extend the Poisson transforms to the larger bundles $V^k(\sigma_\lambda^p)$ and $V^+(\sigma_\lambda^p)$. Since we are only interested in forms annihilated by a power of the Laplacian we restrict ourselves to the case $\lambda = \rho - p\alpha$. Set $S_p := *_{\gamma^p} T_{n-p} \in \text{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma^{n-p}}, V_{\gamma^p})$. We define $q : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $\Pi \ni h \mapsto h(0)$. Note that q is not A -equivariant with respect to the representation 1^+ . However, it gives rise to an elements $S_p^k := S_p \otimes q \in \text{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma^{n-p}} \otimes \Pi^k, V_{\gamma^p})$, and hence to a Poisson transforms

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}_p^+ : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p})) &\rightarrow \Omega^p(X), \quad p = 1, \dots, n. \\ \dot{P}_{p|C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}))}^+ &= \dot{P}_p^k := P_p^{S_p^k}{}_{\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p} \otimes 1^k}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\dot{P}_p^1 = *P_{n-p, (p-1)\alpha-\rho}$. More generally, using $q \circ \text{ev}(f_\mu) = \text{res}_{z=0} f_{(p-1+z)\alpha-\rho}$, $f_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho} C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot^{n-p}))$, we see that

$$\dot{P}_p^+ \circ \text{ev}(f_\mu) = \text{res}_{z=0} * (P_{n-p, (p-1+z)\alpha-\rho} f_{(p-1+z)\alpha-\rho}). \quad (62)$$

An analogous construction provides Poisson transforms $\dot{P}_\pm^+, \dot{P}_\pm^k$,

$$\dot{P}_\pm^+ : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0^\pm)) \rightarrow \Omega^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(X),$$

characterized by

$$\dot{P}_\pm^+ \circ \text{ev}(f_\mu) = \text{res}_{z=0} * (P_{\pm, z\alpha} f_{z\alpha}), \quad f_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0 C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\cdot^\pm)) \quad (63)$$

We now have

Proposition 5.3 *The Poisson transforms $\dot{P}_p^+, \dot{P}_p^k$, $p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$, $\dot{P}_\pm^+, \dot{P}_\pm^k$, provide G -equivariant isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}_p^k &: C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p})) \xrightarrow{\cong} \{\omega \in \Omega^p(X) \mid \Delta^k \omega = 0, d\omega = 0\}, \\ \dot{P}_\pm^k &: C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0^\pm)) \xrightarrow{\cong} \{\omega \in \Omega^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(X) \mid (d*)^k \omega = 0, d\omega = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{P}_p^+ &: C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p})) \xrightarrow{\cong} Z^p(X)_{(\Delta)} , \\ \dot{P}_\pm^+ &: C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0^\pm)) \xrightarrow{\cong} Z^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(X)_{(\Delta)}\end{aligned}$$

satisfying

$$\Delta \circ \dot{P}_p^+ = |\alpha|^2 \dot{P}_p^+ \circ \varrho \circ ((n+1-2p)\text{id} - \varrho) , \quad (64)$$

$$\Delta \circ \dot{P}_\pm^+ = -|\alpha|^2 \dot{P}_\pm^+ \circ \varrho^2 , \quad (65)$$

$$d \circ \dot{P}_\pm^+ = \pm i(-i)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} |\alpha| \dot{P}_\pm^+ \circ \varrho . \quad (66)$$

The corresponding statements for distribution sections on the boundary and forms of moderate growth on X are also true.

Proof. Using (62), (54), and (33) we compute

$$\begin{aligned}d\dot{P}_p^+ \circ \text{ev}(f_\mu) &= \text{res}_{z=0} d * (P_{n-p, (p-1+z)\alpha-\rho} f_{(p-1+z)\alpha-\rho}) \\ &= \text{res}_{z=0} * \delta(P_{n-p, (p-1+z)\alpha-\rho} f_{(p-1+z)\alpha-\rho}) \\ &= 0 , \\ \Delta \dot{P}_p^+ \circ \text{ev}(f_\mu) &= \text{res}_{z=0} \Delta * (P_{n-p, (p-1+z)\alpha-\rho} f_{(p-1+z)\alpha-\rho}) \\ &= \text{res}_{z=0} * \Delta(P_{n-p, (p-1+z)\alpha-\rho} f_{(p-1+z)\alpha-\rho}) \\ &= |\alpha|^2 \text{res}_{z=0} z(n+1-2p-z) * P_{n-p, (p-1+z)\alpha-\rho} f_{(p-1+z)\alpha-\rho} \\ &= |\alpha|^2 \dot{P}_p^+ \circ \text{ev} \circ L_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}((n+1-2p)\text{id} - L_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho})(f_\mu) \\ &= \dot{P}_p^+ \circ |\alpha|^2 \varrho((n+1-2p)\text{id} - \varrho) \circ \text{ev}(f_\mu) .\end{aligned}$$

This shows (64) and that $\text{im } \dot{P}_p^+$ consists of closed forms. The desired mapping properties of $\dot{P}_p^k$ and $\dot{P}_p^+$ now follow from Theorem 5.1 by induction on k . (66) and the further mapping properties of $\dot{P}_\pm^k$ and $\dot{P}_\pm^+$ are proved in an analogous way using (63) and Corollary 5.2. $\square$

Tensoring with V_φ and restricting to Γ -invariants we obtain

Corollary 5.4 *The Poisson transforms $\dot{P}_p^+$, $\dot{P}_\pm^+$, induce isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{P}_p^+ : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) &\xrightarrow{\cong} Z^p(Y, E(\varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})} , \quad p \neq \frac{n+1}{2} , \\ \dot{P}_\pm^+ : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi)) &\xrightarrow{\cong} Z^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(Y, E(\varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})} ,\end{aligned}$$

and

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / \text{im } \varrho_\Gamma \xrightarrow{\cong} H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) , \quad p \neq \frac{n+1}{2} , \quad (67)$$

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi)) / \text{im } \varrho_\Gamma \xrightarrow{\cong} H^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(Y, E(\varphi)) . \quad (68)$$

In all cases under consideration we have for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\text{im } \varrho_\Gamma = \text{im } \varrho_\Gamma^k = E^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi) . \quad (69)$$

Moreover, the maps

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi)) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi))/E^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi) \cong H^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(Y, E(\varphi))$$

and

$$Z^{n-p}(\varphi) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi))/E^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi) \cong H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) ,$$

where $Z^{n-p}(\varphi) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi))$ denotes the space of $(n-p)$ -cocycles in (59), are surjective.

Proof. The first two isomorphisms are a direct consequence of Proposition 5.3. (67), (68) and the first equation in (69) follow from Proposition 2.8 and Equations (64) and (66). Indeed, if $p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$, then the map $(n+1-2p)\text{id} - \varrho_\Gamma$ is invertible. Hence in this case $\hat{\Delta}^k \left(Z^p(Y, E(\varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right) \cong \text{im } \varrho_\Gamma^k$. For $p = \frac{n+1}{2}$ we have $\text{im } \varrho_\Gamma^k \cong (d^*)^k \left(Z^p(Y, E(\varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right)$. Since $d^* \left(Z^p(Y, E(\varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right)$ consists of exact forms Proposition 2.8 implies

$$d^* \left(Z^p(Y, E(\varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right) \subset \hat{\Delta} \left(Z^p(Y, E(\varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right) = (d^*)^2 \left(Z^p(Y, E(\varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})} \right) .$$

Now equality follows.

The second equation in (69) is a consequence of Lemma 4.18.

The surjectivity assertions rely on the fact that any cohomology class has a closed and coclosed representative (see (8)). Indeed, by the above discussion of (59) we have for $p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$

$$\dot{P}_p^1 : Z^{n-p}(\varphi) \xrightarrow{\cong} \ker d \cap \ker \hat{\delta} \subset \Omega^p(Y, E(\varphi)) ,$$

while $\dot{P}_\pm^1$ maps ${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi))$ bijectively to $\ker d \cap \ker \hat{\delta} \subset \Omega^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(Y, E(\varphi))$. The proof of the corollary is now complete. $\square$

Recall the definitions of the integers $0 \leq k_-(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \leq k_+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) < \infty$ and of the space $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ from Section 4. It was shown there that

$$E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k_-}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k_+}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) = {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

and that these spaces are finite-dimensional. We will also need the space

$$Z_\Lambda^p(\varphi) := Z^p(\varphi) \cap (\Omega_{-\infty}^p(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi)$$

of such cocycles of (59) which are supported on the limit set. Now we can state the first main theorem of the paper.

Theorem 5.5 *The Poisson transforms $\dot{P}_p^+$, $\dot{P}_\pm^+$ induce isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned} H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) &\cong {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi), \quad p = 1, \dots, n, \quad p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}, \\ H^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(Y, E(\varphi)) &\cong {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi)) / E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} k_+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi) &\leq k_-(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi) + 1, \\ k_+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi) &\leq k_-(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

If φ is unitary and $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$, then $k_-(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) &\cong \begin{cases} {}^\Gamma(\Omega_\infty^{n-p}(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi) = U_\Lambda(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi), & p > \frac{n+1}{2} \\ {}^\Gamma(\Omega_\infty^\pm(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi) = U_\Lambda(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi), & p = \frac{n+1}{2} \end{cases} \\ &\cong Z_\Lambda^{n-p}(\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The theorem will be a consequence of Corollary 5.4. The assertion concerning unitary φ will then follow from Proposition 4.24. In the following one should replace $n - p$ by $\pm$, if $p = \frac{n+1}{2}$. First of all it is clear that the natural map

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)$$

is injective. In view of (67), (68) and (69) it is therefore sufficient to show that the natural map

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k_-+1}(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)$$

is surjective.

The last assertion of Corollary 5.4 tells us that any element in the quotient

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)$$

can be represented by an element $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi))$. Choose

$$\psi \in C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^{k_-+1}(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi))$$

such that

$$\varrho_B^{k_-}(\psi) = \text{res}(f).$$

Then $f' := f - \text{ext}[k_-](\psi) \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k_-+1}(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi))$. Moreover,

$$f' \equiv f \pmod{E^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)}.$$

This proves the desired surjectivity, and hence the theorem. $\square$

For $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$ and trivial φ the theorem is a fairly direct consequence of the results of Mazzeo/Phillips [50] concerning the L^2 -cohomology of Y . This was already noted by Patterson [57] and was also observed by Lott [48]. Indeed, this observation, among other things, led Patterson [57] to his general conjecture (3) relating the cohomology groups $H^p(\Gamma, F)$, where F is a finite-dimensional representation of G , to invariant distributions on the limit set. This conjecture will be treated on the base of Theorem 5.5 in Section 6. There we will also see that the isomorphism $H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) \cong Z_\Lambda^{n-p}(\varphi)$ holds for $p = \frac{n}{2}$, too. L^2 -cohomology will be discussed in Section 9.

It would be more natural not to exclude the case of cocompact Γ from the considerations. Recall that in this case $\Lambda = \partial X$. In fact, for unitary φ the analog of Theorem 5.5 is a simple consequence of Theorem 5.1 and classical Hodge theory as has been already observed in [30]. For nonunitary φ the assertion will be less precise since Proposition 2.8 does not hold in this case. However, combining Proposition 2.9 with Proposition 5.3 and using classical Hodge theory for unitary φ we obtain

Proposition 5.6 *There are integers $k_+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)$, $k_+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) &= {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k_+}(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) , \\ {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi)) &= {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^{k_+}(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi)) \end{aligned}$$

as in the noncocompact case. These spaces are finite-dimensional, and the Poisson transforms $\dot{P}_p^+$, $\dot{P}_\pm^+$ induce surjections

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) , \quad {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \varphi)) \rightarrow H^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(Y, E(\varphi)) .$$

If φ is unitary, then Theorem 5.5 holds with the convention $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma; \varphi) = \{0\}$, $k_-(\sigma; \varphi) = 0$. Moreover, in this case we have for all p

$$H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) \cong Z_\Lambda^{n-p}(\varphi) \cong Z_\Lambda^p(\varphi) .$$

6 Finite-dimensional G -representations as coefficients

In this section we continue the investigation of the cohomology groups $H^p(\Gamma, V_\psi) \cong H^p(Y, E(\psi))$ for discrete subgroups Γ acting convex cocompactly on $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$. We want to understand more precisely the situation that the Γ -representation ψ has the form $\psi = \pi|_\Gamma \otimes \varphi$, where (π, F) is a finite-dimensional representation of G . This understanding will be achieved by applying to Theorem 5.5 a variant of the translation functor, i.e. tensoring with F followed by the projection to the generalized infinitesimal character of F . It will bring into play all the spaces ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$, $\sigma \in \hat{M}$, $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$. Since any finite-dimensional G -representation is semisimple we can and will assume that F is irreducible. Of course one is mainly interested in the case where the additional twist φ is trivial or at least unitary.

For a while we can drop the assumption that $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$. In fact, Proposition 6.1 below, suitably interpreted, holds for any connected semisimple Lie group G with minimal parabolic subgroup P . We use the notation and conventions fixed in Section 4 around Equation (36). There are corresponding closed positive Weyl chambers $\mathfrak{t}_+^* \subset i\mathfrak{t}^*$, $\mathfrak{h}_+^* \subset \mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{C}^+$. They satisfy $\mathfrak{a}_+^* \subset \mathfrak{h}_+^* \subset \mathfrak{a}_+^* \oplus \mathfrak{t}_+^*$. We set $\rho_\mathfrak{g} := \rho + \rho_\mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{h}_+^*$. We consider the following subset of $W(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{C})$:

$$W^1 := \{w \in W(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{C}) \mid w(\mathfrak{h}_+^*) \subset \mathfrak{a}^* \oplus \mathfrak{t}_+^*\}.$$

To a finite-dimensional irreducible representation (π_ν, F) with highest weight $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}_+^*$ and an element $w \in W^1$ we associate weights

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_w &:= w(\nu + \rho_\mathfrak{g})|_{\mathfrak{t}} - \rho_\mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{t}_+^*, \\ \lambda_w &:= -w(\nu + \rho_\mathfrak{g})|_{\mathfrak{a}} \in \mathfrak{a}^*. \end{aligned}$$

If M is connected, then there is exactly one irreducible M -representation σ^w with highest weight μ_w . In general σ^w is uniquely determined by the additional requirement that the center $Z(G) \subset M$ of G acts by the same character as on F . Then $\lambda_w \in I_{\sigma^w}^r$. The only linear rank one group, where M is not connected, is $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$. In this case $M = \{\pm \text{id}\}$, and $\sigma^w(-\text{id}) = (-1)^{\dim F - 1}$ for both elements $w \in W^1$. We denote the resulting P -representation $\sigma_{\lambda_w}^w$ by σ_{F, λ_w}^w . The set

$$\{C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w)) \mid w \in W^1\}$$

consists of all principal series representations having the infinitesimal character $\chi_F = \chi_{\nu + \rho_\mathfrak{g}}$ and the central character of F .

For a $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -module V and a character $\chi : \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we consider the generalized eigenspace

$$V^\chi := \{v \in V \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } (z - \chi(z))^k v = 0 \text{ for all } z \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})\}.$$

If V is locally $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -finite, i.e., $\dim \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})v < \infty$ for all $v \in V$, then we have

$$V = \bigoplus_{\chi} V^\chi.$$

Since the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module of the G -representation

$$V := C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda)) \otimes F = C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu))$$

is admissible and finitely generated V considered as a $Z(\mathfrak{g})$ -module is locally finite, and the sum

$$C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu)) = \bigoplus_{\chi} C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu))^\chi .$$

is finite. Here the $Z(\mathfrak{g})$ -action comes from the diagonal G -action. Restricting the attention to the subalgebra $\mathbb{C}[\Omega] \subset Z(\mathfrak{g})$ we get a weaker finite decomposition into generalized eigenspaces of the Casimir operator

$$C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu)) = \bigoplus_{\kappa \in \mathbb{C}} C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu))^\kappa . \quad (70)$$

The announced application of the translation functor will rest on the the following

Proposition 6.1 *Let (π_ν, F) be a finite-dimensional irreducible representation of G with highest weight $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}_+^*$, and let $w \in W^1$. Let $\kappa_F := \|\nu + \rho_{\mathfrak{g}}\|^2 - \|\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}\|^2$ be the Casimir eigenvalue on F . Then for $\sharp \in \{\infty, \omega\}$*

$$C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w)) \cong C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu))^{\chi_F} = C^{-\sharp}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu))^{\kappa_F} .$$

More precisely, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there are G -equivariant differential operators

$$\begin{aligned} D_{k,w} : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w)) &\rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu)) , \\ D^{k,w} : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu)) &\rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w)) \end{aligned}$$

satisfying

1. $D_{k,w} : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu))^{\kappa_F}$ is an isomorphism.
2. $D^{k,w} \circ D_{k,w} = \text{id}$.
3. $D_{k+1,w} \circ C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w)) = D_{k,w}$, $\varrho \circ D_{k+1,w} = D_{k,w} \circ \varrho$. The analogous assertions hold for $D^{k+1,w}$.

Proof. The proposition, at least for $k = 1$, is well-known among representation theorists (see e.g. [64], Section 5). However, it is more convenient for us to give a direct proof here rather than to cite all relevant results from several places in the literature.

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.15 we use the isomorphism of G -bundles

$$V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu) \cong V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w \otimes \pi_{\nu|P}) .$$

The P -representation $W = \sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w \otimes \pi_{\nu|P}$ has a Jordan-Hölder series

$$0 = W_0 \subset W_1 \subset \dots \subset W_l = W$$

such that on each irreducible composition factor $Q_r := W_r/W_{r-1}$ the group MA acts irreducibly with highest weight of the form

$$w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}) + \rho - \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + \mu_r, \quad (71)$$

where μ_r is a MA -weight of F . It follows that $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu))$ has a composition series with composition factors R_r isomorphic to the induced representations

$$\text{Ind}_P^G(Q_r \otimes \Pi^k) = C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\lambda_r}^r)),$$

where σ^r is a M -representation having highest weight $(\mu_r + w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}))|_{\mathfrak{t}} - \rho_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and $\lambda_r = -(\mu_r + w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}))|_{\mathfrak{a}}$. Thus R_r has generalized infinitesimal character $\chi_{\mu_r + w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}})}$.

We now assume that R_r has generalized Casimir eigenvalue κ_F . This means

$$\|\nu + \rho_{\mathfrak{g}}\|^2 = \|\mu_r + w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}})\|^2.$$

We obtain

$$0 \leq \|\nu\|^2 - \|\mu_r\|^2 = -2\langle \nu - w^{-1}(\mu_r), \rho_{\mathfrak{g}} \rangle. \quad (72)$$

Since $w^{-1}(\mu_r)$ is a weight of F , too, the difference $\nu - w^{-1}(\mu_r)$ is a nonnegative linear combination of positive roots. Hence the right hand side of (72) cannot be positive. It follows that $\mu_r = w(\nu)$.

We claim that the MA -representation $\tau_{w, \nu}$ with highest weight

$$w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}) + \rho - \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + w(\nu)$$

occurs in W exactly once. Indeed, $w(\nu)$ is an extremal weight of F , thus it occurs in F with multiplicity one. Hence $\tau_{w, \nu}$ can occur in W at most with multiplicity one. It remains to show that $w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}) + \rho - \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + w(\nu)$ is in fact a highest MA -weight. If not, then $w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}) + \rho - \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + w(\nu) + \beta$, where β is a sum of positive $\mathfrak{m}$ -roots, would be a highest weight. Since $w \in W^1$ we have for any positive $\mathfrak{m}$ -root ε

$$\langle w^{-1}(\varepsilon), \rho_{\mathfrak{g}} \rangle = \langle \varepsilon, w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}) \rangle > 0.$$

Hence $w^{-1}(\varepsilon) \in \Delta^+$, and $\nu + w^{-1}(\beta)$ is not a weight of F . Thus, also $w(\nu) + \beta$ does not occur in F . Therefore (see (71)) $w(\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}) + \rho - \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} + w(\nu) + \beta$ cannot be a weight of W . The claim follows.

Summarizing the above discussion we see that exactly one of the composition factors R_r has generalized Casimir eigenvalue κ_F , and that this composition factor is isomorphic to $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w))$ which has generalized infinitesimal character χ_F . It then follows from (70) that this composition factor occurs as a direct summand of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu))$. This gives the desired isomorphism. In order to finish the proof we have to convince ourself that this isomorphism is implemented by differential operators $D_{k, w}$ and $D^{k, w}$. Let

$$P_k : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu))$$

be the projection onto $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu))^{\kappa_F}$ with respect to (70). Since the sum (70) is finite it is given by the natural action of a certain polynomial of the Casimir operator on

$C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu))$, and is therefore a differential operator. Let r be such that $R_r \cong C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w))$ as above. By τ_r and τ_{r-1} we denote the P -representations on W_r and W_{r-1} , respectively. Then $V^k(\tau_{r-1}) \subset V^k(\tau_r) \subset V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu)$, and there is a projection

$$p_{k,r} : V^k(\tau_r) \rightarrow V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w) .$$

Moreover,

$$\text{im } P_k \subset C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\tau_r)) , \quad C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\tau_{r-1})) \subset \ker P_k . \quad (73)$$

Thus,

$$D^{k,w} := p_{k,r} \circ P_k$$

is a well-defined G -equivariant differential operator. Choose an embedding

$$i_r : V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w) \rightarrow V(\tau_r)$$

such that

$$p_{1,r} \circ i_r = \text{id} .$$

We set

$$i_{k,r} = i_r \otimes \text{id} : V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w) \rightarrow V^k(\tau_r) \subset V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu) .$$

While $i_{k,r}$ need not to be G -equivariant the composition

$$D_{k,w} := P_k \circ i_{k,r}$$

is G -equivariant because of (73). It is now easily checked that the differential operators $D_{k,w}$ and $D^{k,w}$ enjoy the Properties 1, 2 and 3. This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Now let $\Gamma \subset G$ be convex cocompact, and let (φ, V_φ) be a finite-dimensional representation of Γ . Let $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ act on the first factor of

$$C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu)) \otimes V_\varphi = C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi)) .$$

Then

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi)) \subset {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi)) \subset C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi))$$

are $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -submodules. Moreover, using e.g. Lemma 4.18, we see that $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi)$ and $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi)$ are $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -submodules, too. Here, if Γ is cocompact, we set $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi) := \{0\}$.

Corollary 6.2 *The differential operators $D_{k,w} \otimes \text{id}$ provide isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned} {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w, \varphi)) &\cong {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F} , \\ {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w, \varphi)) &\cong {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F} , \\ E^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w, \varphi) &\cong E^+(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi)^{\chi_F} , \\ E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w, \varphi) &\cong E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_w}^w, \pi_\nu \otimes \varphi)^{\chi_F} . \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first isomorphism is obvious. The second one follows from the existence of the left inverse $D^{k,w}$ which is again a local operator. The third isomorphism is a consequence of Lemma 4.18 and Property 3 of the operators $D_{k,w}$ and $D^{k,w}$. Now the last isomorphism follows, too. $\square$

We now return to our assumption $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, i.e., $G = Spin(1, n)$ or $G = SO(1, n)_0$. The generating set of simple reflections $\{s_\varepsilon \mid \varepsilon \in \Pi\}$, where $\Pi \subset \Delta^+$ is the set of simple roots, determines a length function on $W(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{C})$. If n is even, then

$$W^1 = \{w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}\},$$

where w_i is the unique element of length i in W^1 . For odd n we have

$$W^1 = \{w_0, \dots, w_{\frac{n-3}{2}}, w_+, w_-, w_{\frac{n+1}{2}}, \dots, w_{n-1}\},$$

where w_i and $w_\pm$ have length i and $\frac{n-1}{2}$, respectively. We abbreviate

$$\mu_p := \mu_w, \quad \lambda_p := \lambda_w, \quad \sigma_{F, \lambda_p}^p := \sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w, \quad \text{where } w = w_{n-1-p}, \quad (74)$$

$$\mu_\pm := \mu_w, \quad \lambda_\pm := \lambda_w, \quad \sigma_{F, \lambda_\pm}^\pm := \sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w, \quad \text{where } w = w_\mp. \quad (75)$$

Occasionally, we will also need a representation associated to $p = \frac{n-1}{2}$. We set

$$\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n-1}{2}}}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} := \sigma_{F, \lambda_+}^+ \oplus \sigma_{F, \lambda_-}^-.$$

We would like to write down things more explicitly. First let n be even. In standard coordinates $\mathfrak{a}^* \oplus i\mathfrak{t}^* \cong \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$ with standard basis $e_0, e_1, \dots, e_{\frac{n-2}{2}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi &= \{e_{i-1} - e_i \mid i = 1, \dots, \frac{n-2}{2}\} \cup \{e_{\frac{n-2}{2}}\}, \\ \mathfrak{h}_+^* &= \{(m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}}) \mid m_0 \geq m_1 \geq \dots \geq m_{\frac{n-2}{2}} \geq 0\}, \\ \mathfrak{t}_+^* &= \{(m_1, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}}) \mid m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_{\frac{n-2}{2}} \geq 0\}, \\ \rho_{\mathfrak{g}} &= \left(\frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{n-3}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The Weyl group $W(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{C})$ consists of permutations of the coordinates composed with an arbitrary number of sign changes. For $0 \leq p \leq \frac{n-2}{2}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_p(m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}}) &= (m_p, m_0, \dots, m_{p-1}, m_{p+1}, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}}), \\ w_{n-1-p}(m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}}) &= (-m_p, m_0, \dots, m_{p-1}, m_{p+1}, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Associated to a highest weight $\nu = (m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}})$ we get for $0 \leq p \leq \frac{n-2}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_p &= (m_0 + 1, m_1 + 1, \dots, m_{p-1} + 1, m_{p+1}, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}}) = \mu_{n-1-p}, \\ \lambda_p &= \rho + (m_p - p)\alpha, \quad \lambda_{n-1-p} = -\lambda_p. \end{aligned}$$

Let now n be odd. In standard coordinates $\mathfrak{a}^* \oplus i\mathfrak{t}^* \cong \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ with standard basis $e_0, e_1, \dots, e_{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi &= \{e_{i-1} - e_i \mid i = 1, \dots, \frac{n-1}{2}\} \cup \{e_{\frac{n-3}{2}} + e_{\frac{n-1}{2}}\}, \\ \mathfrak{h}_+^* &= \{(m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}) \mid m_0 \geq \dots \geq m_{\frac{n-3}{2}} \geq |m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}|\}, \\ \mathfrak{t}_+^* &= \{(m_1, \dots, m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}) \mid m_1 \geq \dots \geq m_{\frac{n-3}{2}} \geq |m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}|\}, \\ \rho_{\mathfrak{g}} &= \left(\frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{n-3}{2}, \dots, 0\right). \end{aligned}$$

The Weyl group $W(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})$ consists of permutations of the coordinates composed with an even number sign changes. For $0 \leq p \leq \frac{n-3}{2}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_p(m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}) &= (m_p, m_0, \dots, m_{p-1}, m_{p+1}, \dots, m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}), \\ w_+(m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}) &= (m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}, m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-3}{2}}), \\ w_-(m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}) &= (-m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}, m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-5}{2}}, -m_{\frac{n-3}{2}}), \\ w_{n-1-p}(m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}) &= (-m_p, m_0, \dots, m_{p-1}, m_{p+1}, \dots, m_{\frac{n-3}{2}}, -m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Associated to a highest weight $\nu = (m_0, \dots, m_{\frac{n-1}{2}})$ we get for $0 \leq p \leq \frac{n-3}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_p &= (m_0 + 1, m_1 + 1, \dots, m_{p-1} + 1, m_{p+1}, \dots, m_{\frac{n-3}{2}}, -m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}), \quad \lambda_p = \rho + (m_p - p)\alpha, \\ \mu_{\pm} &= (m_0 + 1, m_1 + 1, \dots, m_{\frac{n-5}{2}} + 1, \mp(m_{\frac{n-3}{2}} + 1)), \quad \lambda_{\pm} = \pm m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}\alpha, \\ \mu_{n-1-p} &= (m_0 + 1, m_1 + 1, \dots, m_{p-1} + 1, m_{p+1}, \dots, m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}), \quad \lambda_{n-1-p} = -\lambda_p. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the P -representations considered in Section 5 are associated to the trivial G -representation:

$$\sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_p}^p = \sigma_{\rho-p\alpha}^p, \quad \sigma_{\mathbb{C}, \lambda_{\pm}}^{\pm} = \sigma_0^{\mp}. \quad (76)$$

As a next step we want to apply the translation functor to the complex (59). Indeed, replacing there φ by $\pi_{\nu} \otimes \varphi$ we obtain a complex of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules which decomposes into generalized $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -eigenspaces. Taking the component with generalized infinitesimal character χ_F and applying Proposition 6.1 we obtain the complex

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow \Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_0}^0, \varphi)) &\xrightarrow{d_F^0} \Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_1}^1, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{d_F^1} \\ \dots &\xrightarrow{d_F^{n-2}} \Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-1}}^{n-1}, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{d_F^{n-1}} \Gamma(F \otimes V_{\varphi}) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

where for $p < n-1$ the operator $d_F^p = D^{1, w_{n-1-p}} \circ d \circ D_{1, w_{n-1-p}}$ is a differential operator while $d_F^{n-1} = D^{1, w_0} \circ \int_{\partial X} \circ D_{1, w_0}$ can be identified with a multiple of the intertwining operator $\hat{J}_{\sigma_F^{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1}}$ if one considers $F \otimes V_{\varphi}$ as sitting in $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_0}^0, \varphi))$. For trivial Γ (and φ) the complex (77) is exact and appears in the literature under various names like BGG-resolution or Želobenko complex (see e.g. [71], [5], [40]). By $Z_F^p(\varphi)$ and $Z_{F, \Lambda}^p(\varphi)$ we denote the spaces of p -cocycles of (77) and of p -cocycles supported on the limit set, respectively.

Now we can state the second main theorem of the paper. Recall that by convention $E^+(\sigma_{\lambda}, \pi \otimes \varphi) = \{0\}$ for cocompact Γ .

Theorem 6.3 *Let (π, F) be an irreducible finite-dimensional representation of G , and let (φ, V_φ) an irreducible representation of Γ . There are surjections ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$, ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_\pm}^\pm, \varphi)) \rightarrow H^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$. If Γ is not cocompact or φ is unitary, then we have the following isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned} H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) &\cong {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi), \quad p = 1, \dots, n, \quad p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}, \\ H^{\frac{n+1}{2}}(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) &\cong {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_\pm}^\pm, \varphi)) / E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_\pm}^\pm, \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} k_+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) &\leq k_-(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) + 1, \\ k_+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_\pm}^\pm, \varphi) &\leq k_-(\sigma_{F, \lambda_\pm}^\pm, \varphi) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

If φ is unitary and $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$, then $k_-(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) = 0$ and

$$H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) \cong \begin{cases} {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) = U_\Lambda(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi), & p > \frac{n+1}{2} \\ {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_\pm}^\pm, \varphi)) = U_\Lambda(\sigma_{F, \lambda_\pm}^\pm, \varphi), & p = \frac{n+1}{2} \end{cases} \quad (78)$$

$$\cong Z_{F, \Lambda}^{n-p}(\varphi). \quad (79)$$

If φ is unitary and $p = \frac{n}{2}$, then $k_+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) \leq \max\{k_-(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi), 1\}$ and

$$H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) \cong Z_{F, \Lambda}^{n-p}(\varphi). \quad (80)$$

If, in addition, Γ is cocompact, then we have for all p

$$H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) \cong Z_{F, \Lambda}^{n-p}(\varphi) \cong Z_{F, \Lambda}^p(\varphi).$$

Proof. If (ψ, V_ψ) is a finite-dimensional representation of Γ , then we denote by $\tilde{E}(\psi)$ the flat vector bundle $X \times V_\psi$ over X . It carries a G action $(x, v) \mapsto (gx, v)$ and a Γ -action $(x, v) \mapsto (\gamma x, \psi(\gamma)v)$. We equip the de Rham complex $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \cong {}^\Gamma \Omega^*(X, \tilde{E}(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ with the $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -action induced by the tensor product G -action on

$$\Omega^*(X, \tilde{E}(\varphi)) \otimes F \cong \Omega^*(X, \tilde{E}(\pi \otimes \varphi)). \quad (81)$$

This induces a $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -module structure on $H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) \cong H^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$. Then the isomorphisms in Theorem 5.5 (with φ replaced by $\pi \otimes \varphi$) become isomorphisms of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules. Now, by general principles, $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ acts on $H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$ by the infinitesimal character χ_F . In order to see this we look at the category of $(\mathbb{C}[\Gamma], \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g}))$ -bimodules. Taking Γ -invariants defines a left exact functor from this category to the category of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules. Its right derived functors coincide with $H^p(\Gamma, \cdot)$, but now provide also $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -module structures on the cohomology groups. We want to study the $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules $H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$, where $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ acts on the first factor of $F \otimes V_\varphi$. For this it is sufficient to look at resolutions of $F \otimes V_\varphi$ by Γ -acyclic $(\mathbb{C}[\Gamma], \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g}))$ -bimodules. The Γ -modules $\Omega^p(X, \tilde{E}(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ are acyclic by [14], Lemma 2.4. Taking Γ -invariants identifies the cohomology of $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ with $H^*(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$ as

a $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -module. There is a second $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -module structure on this de Rham complex coming from the G -action on the second factor in (81) which gives rise to a resolution of $F \otimes V_\varphi$, too. It follows that $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ acts on $H^*(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$ by χ_F .

At least for noncocompact Γ the theorem, except for (80), now follows from Corollary 6.2 by taking the components with generalized infinitesimal character χ_F of all the spaces appearing in Theorem 5.5. For cocompact Γ we use Proposition 5.6 instead. That in case of unitary φ the resulting surjection is an isomorphism follows from classical Hodge theory with respect to the Laplacian associated to a so called admissible scalar product on F . This Laplacian coincides with the action of $-\Omega + \kappa_F$ (see [11], Chapter II, §2, for all that), thus acts by zero on the relevant spaces. These facts will be discussed further in Subsection 7.3 and Section 9.

It remains to prove (80) for noncocompact Γ . For this we will need a couple of results which are of interest in their own right.

Lemma 6.4 *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $res_k : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$ be the restriction map. Then ext induces an isomorphism*

$$e_k : \text{coker } res_k \xrightarrow{\cong} E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) / \varrho_\Gamma^k \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) .$$

In particular, if $k \geq k_+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)$, then

$$\text{coker } res_k \cong E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) .$$

Proof. Choose $l \geq \max\{k_-(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi), k\}$. Let $[f] \in \text{coker } res_k$ be represented by $\rho_B^{l-k} f_l$ for some $f_l \in C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^l(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$. Then we set

$$e_k([f]) := ext[l]f_l \bmod \varrho_\Gamma^k \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) .$$

We have to check that e_k is well-defined. Assume that

$$\rho_B^{l-k} f_l = res_k \psi \quad \text{for some } \psi \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) .$$

Choose $f_{k+l} \in C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^{k+l}(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$ such that $\rho_B^k f_{k+l} = f_l$. We obtain

$$ext[l]f_l = ext[l](\varrho_B^k f_{k+l}) = \varrho_\Gamma^k(ext[l]f_{k+l}) = \varrho_\Gamma^k(ext[l]f_{k+l} - \psi) .$$

Now $res(ext[l]f_{k+l} - \psi) = 0$, hence $ext[l]f_l \in \varrho_\Gamma^k \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right)$. Thus e_k is well-defined.

Vice versa, assume that

$$ext[l]f_l = \varrho_\Gamma^k(ext[l]f_{k+l}) = \varrho_\Gamma^k(\psi_0) \quad \text{for some } \psi_0 \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) .$$

Then $\psi := \text{ext}[l]f_{k+l} - \psi_0 \in C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$ and $\text{res}_k \psi = f_l$. Thus e_k is injective.

Finally, it follows from Lemma 4.5 that e_k is surjective. $\square$

Proposition 6.5 *Let φ be unitary. Then*

$$\dim Z_{F, \Lambda}^{n-p}(\varphi) \geq \dim H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) .$$

Proof. For $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$ we have already shown equality. Thus we can assume $p \leq \frac{n}{2}$, in particular $\lambda_{F, n-p} < 0$. By Lemma 6.4 we have that for $k \geq k_+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)$

$$\dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) = \dim H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) + \dim \text{coker } \text{res}_k . \quad (82)$$

As in the proof of Proposition 4.16, let $\hat{J}_+ : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{p-1}}^{p-1}, \varphi))$ be the intertwining operator induced by $\hat{J}_{\sigma_{F, \mu}^{n-p}, \mu}$, which is regular at $\mu = \lambda_{F, n-p} < 0$. The knowledge of the composition factors of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}))$ (see e.g. [25], Ch. 5) gives for $p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$

$$Z_F^{n-p}(\varphi) = {}^\Gamma(\ker \hat{J}_+) .$$

Thus in view of (82) it is enough to show that

$$\dim \hat{J}_+ \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) \leq \dim \text{coker } \text{res}_k . \quad (83)$$

As in the proof of Theorem 5.5 we see that any element $h \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$ can be written as $h = \psi - \text{ext}[l]f_{l+1}$, where $\psi \in Z_F^{n-p}(\varphi)$ and $f_{l+1} \in C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^{l+1}(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$ such that $\varrho_B^l f_{l+1} = \text{res}(\psi)$. This implies that $\hat{J}_+(h) = -\hat{J}_+(\text{ext}[l]f_{l+1}) \in E^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{p-1}}^{p-1}, \varphi)$. Now $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{p-1}}^{p-1}, \varphi) = \{0\}$ by Proposition 4.21, 2. It follows that

$$\hat{J}_+ \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) \cap {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{p-1}}^{p-1}, \varphi)) = \{0\}$$

and thus

$$\dim \hat{J}_+ \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) = \dim \text{res} \circ \hat{J}_+ \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) .$$

Since $V(\tilde{\sigma}_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \tilde{\varphi})$ is the complex conjugate of $V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)$ and $\text{res} \circ \hat{J}_+ = (\text{res} \circ \hat{J})_+$ Proposition 4.17 now implies that the dimension on the right hand side does not exceed $\dim \text{coker } \text{res}_k$. This proves (83), and hence the proposition. $\square$

Lemma 6.6 *Let φ be unitary and n be even. Then*

$$Z_{F, \Lambda}^{\frac{n}{2}}(\varphi) \cap E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi) = \{0\} .$$

Proof. The lemma relies on the fact that the G -representation $\ker d_F^{\frac{n}{2}} \subset C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}))$ is the direct sum of the distribution globalization of the two irreducible discrete series representations having infinitesimal character χ_F (see e.g. [25], Ch. 5). Thus we can exploit unitarity in a similar way as for the corresponding assertions for $p \geq \frac{n-1}{2}$.

If F has highest weight $(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}})$, then $\sigma_F^{\frac{n}{2}}$ has highest weight $(m_0 + 1, m_1 + 1, \dots, m_{\frac{n-4}{2}} + 1)$. We consider the K -representation $\gamma = \gamma^+ \oplus \gamma^-$, where $\gamma^\pm$ has highest weight $(m_0 + 1, m_1 + 1, \dots, m_{\frac{n-4}{2}} + 1, \pm(m_{\frac{n-2}{2}} + 1))$. Let $\bar{G}$ be the group $SO(1, n)$ or its double cover, respectively, having two connected components. Consider also the corresponding groups $\bar{K}$ and $\bar{M}$. Then $\bar{M} \cong M \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. Letting the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -factor act trivially we obtain an $\bar{M}$ -action on $V_{\sigma_F^{\frac{n}{2}}}$. Thus $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}))$, $\ker d_F^{\frac{n}{2}} \subset C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi))$ become $\bar{G}$ -representations. Then $\ker d_F^{\frac{n}{2}}$ is the unique irreducible $\bar{G}$ -subrepresentation of $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}))$. The representation of K on V_γ can be uniquely extended to a $\bar{K}$ representation such that $\dim \text{Hom}_{\bar{M}}(V_{\sigma_F^{\frac{n}{2}}}, V_\gamma) = 1$.

Let $0 \neq T \in \text{Hom}_{\bar{M}}(V_{\sigma_F^{\frac{n}{2}}}, V_\gamma)$. There is a corresponding Poisson transform

$$P^T := P_{\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}}^T : C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}})) \rightarrow C^\infty(G, V_\gamma)^K,$$

which becomes $\bar{G}$ -equivariant. Since the $\bar{K}$ -type γ occurs in $\ker d_F^{\frac{n}{2}}$, it is injective.

Let $\Phi \in Z_F^p(\varphi)$, $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^2(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi))$ such that $\varrho_\Gamma f \in Z_F^p(\varphi)$ and $\text{res}(\Phi)$ and $\text{res}(f)$ are smooth. We claim that $P^T \Phi, P^T \varrho_\Gamma f \in [L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) \otimes V_\gamma]^K$ and that there is a non-zero constant c such that

$$(P^T \Phi, P^T \varrho_\Gamma f) = c(\text{res}(\Phi), \text{res}(\hat{J}_2 f))_B. \quad (84)$$

Here $\hat{J}_2 : C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^2(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^2(\sigma_{F, -\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi))$ is the intertwining operator induced by the family $\hat{J}_{\sigma_F^{\frac{n}{2}}, \mu}$ as in the proof of Proposition 4.16, and $(\cdot, \cdot)_B$ is the natural sesqui-linear pairing between $C^\infty(B, V_B(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi))$ and $C^{-\infty}(B, V_B(\sigma_{F, -\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi))$. Since $\varrho_\Gamma f \in Z_F^p(\varphi) \subset \ker \hat{J}_{\sigma_F^{\frac{n}{2}}, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}$ we have $\hat{J}_2 f \in C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_{F, -\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi))$.

If $\Phi \in Z_{F, \Lambda}^p(\varphi) \cap E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi)$, then $\Phi = \text{ext}[k_- + 1]\phi$ for some $\phi \in C^\infty(B, V^{k_- + 1}(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}, \varphi))$, thus $\Phi = p_\Gamma f$ for $f = \text{ext}[k_-]\phi$. Assuming (84) we obtain $\|P^T \Phi\|^2 = c(0, \text{res}(\hat{J}_2 f))_B = 0$, hence $\Phi = 0$. This implies the lemma.

It remains to prove (84). Since $\ker d_F^{\frac{n}{2}}$ consists of discrete series representations and has

infinitesimal character χ_F we obtain for smooth $\psi \in \ker d_F^{\frac{n}{2}}$

$$P^T \psi(ka) = a^{\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}} - \rho} \tilde{\psi}(k) + O(a^{\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}} - \rho - \varepsilon}) ,$$

where $\tilde{\psi}$ is some smooth V_γ -valued function on K . Note that $\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}} < 0$. The map $\psi \mapsto T^* \tilde{\psi}$ is a $\bar{G}$ -intertwining operator from the smooth vectors in $\ker d_F^{\frac{n}{2}}$ to $C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}))$. Since $\ker d_F^{\frac{n}{2}}$ is the unique irreducible $\bar{G}$ -subrepresentation of $C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}))$ we conclude that $T^* \tilde{\psi}$ is a multiple of ψ . We obtain as in [21], Lemma 6.2, 3, that for $kM \in \Omega$

$$P^T \Phi(ka) = a^{\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}} - \rho} \tilde{\Phi}(k) + O(a^{\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}} - \rho - \varepsilon})$$

with $T^* \tilde{\Phi}$ a constant multiple of $\text{res}(\Phi)$. As in Section 5, P^T can be extended to $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^2(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\frac{n}{2}}}^{\frac{n}{2}}))$, and for $kM \in \Omega$

$$P^T f(ka) = a^{-\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}} - \rho} T \hat{J}_2 f(k) + O(a^{-\lambda_{\frac{n}{2}} - \rho - \varepsilon}) .$$

Since $(\Omega - \kappa_F) P^T f$ is a constant multiple of $P^T \varrho_\Gamma f$ we can use Green's formula as in the proof of [21], Prop. 10.4, in order to conclude (84). $\square$

Lemma 6.6 implies that the map $Z_{F, \Lambda}^{\frac{n}{2}}(\varphi) \rightarrow H^{\frac{n}{2}}(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$ is injective. On the other hand $\dim Z_{F, \Lambda}^{\frac{n}{2}}(\varphi) \geq H^{\frac{n}{2}}(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$ by Proposition 6.5. Thus the map is also surjective. This finishes the proof of (80). $\square$

That the cohomology groups $H^p(\Gamma, F)$ should be representable by currents on the limit set was conjectured by Patterson [57]. As explained in the introduction, he suggested that, at least for trivial φ , the isomorphism (79), which we have now proved for $p \geq \frac{n}{2}$, should be true for all p . What we can say in general is the following

Corollary 6.7 *If φ is unitary and ext_μ is regular at $\mu = \lambda_{F, n-p}$, i.e. $k_-(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) = 0$, then*

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) = Z_{F, \Lambda}^{n-p}(\varphi) \cong H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) .$$

Proof. By assumption $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) = \{0\}$. This implies injectivity of the map

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) .$$

We now apply Proposition 6.5. $\square$

However, the map $Z_{F, \Lambda}^{n-p}(\varphi) \rightarrow H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$ is not injective in general. Let n be odd, and let Γ be such that B is disconnected (this happens for example for cocompact subgroups of

$SO(1, n-1)_0$ considered as a subgroup of $SO(1, n)_0$. Let $f \in C^\infty(B, V(1_\rho))$ be the characteristic function of one connected component. The residue D_ρ of $\hat{J}_\lambda$ at $\lambda = \rho$ is a differential operator. Its kernel is the one-dimensional space of constant functions while its image is equal to $\ker \hat{J}_{-\rho}$. Thus $0 \neq h := D_\rho(\text{ext}_\rho f) \in Z_\Lambda^{n-1}$. Choosing a family $f_\mu \in C^\infty(B, V(1_\mu))$ such that $f_\rho = f$ we obtain a family $h_\nu := -\hat{J}_{-\nu} \circ \text{ext}_{-\nu} f_{-\nu} \in {}^\Gamma \mathcal{M}_{-\rho}^1 C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(1_\cdot))$ such that $\text{ev}(h_\nu) = h$. Thus $h \in E_\Lambda^1(1_{-\rho})$ by Corollary 4.15 and hence maps to zero in $H^1(\Gamma, \mathbb{C})$. Using embedding we also get examples for all even $n > 2$. In spite of Lemma 6.5 we do not know whether the map $Z_{F, \Lambda}^{n-p}(\varphi) \rightarrow H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$ is surjective in general.

We have the following dimension formulas.

Corollary 6.8 *Assume that Γ is not cocompact. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) &= \dim H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) \\ &\quad + \dim \left[E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) / \varrho_\Gamma^k \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) \right] \\ &= \dim H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) + \dim \text{coker } \text{res}_k. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Here $\text{res}_k : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$ is the restriction map.

Proof. Let ϱ_Λ be the map induced by ϱ_Γ on ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$. Since $\text{im } \varrho_\Lambda^k \subset E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)$ (see (69)) we obtain by Theorem 6.3

$$\begin{aligned} \dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) &= \dim \ker \varrho_\Lambda^k \\ &= \dim \text{coker } \varrho_\Lambda^k \\ &= \dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) \\ &\quad + \dim E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) / \text{im } \varrho_\Lambda^k \\ &= \dim H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) + \dim E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) / \text{im } \varrho_\Lambda^k. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (85) is now a consequence of Lemma 6.4. $\square$

In [17] we obtained for $n = 2$ by different methods that

$$\dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(1_{-\rho-l\alpha})) = \begin{cases} \dim H^1(\Gamma, F_{2l+1}) + 1 & \Gamma \text{ elementary} \\ \dim H^1(\Gamma, F_{2l+1}) & \text{else} \end{cases}. \quad (86)$$

Here $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and F_k is the irreducible $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ -representation of dimension k . In that paper no natural map ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(1_{-\rho-l\alpha})) \rightarrow H^1(\Gamma, F_{2l+1})$ was studied. This map is now provided by Theorem 6.3. By (80) it is bijective when restricted to $Z_{F_{2l+1}, \Lambda}^1(1)$. Now (86) implies that for non-elementary Γ we have

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(1_{-\rho-n\alpha})) = Z_{F_{2l+1}, \Lambda}^1(1). \quad (87)$$

In fact, (87) has been proved directly by topological considerations in [17], Lemma 5.2.

Corollary 6.9 *If $n = 2$ and Γ is non-elementary, then for all $k \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$ the extension map*

$$\text{ext}_\lambda : C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(1_\lambda)) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(1_\lambda))$$

is regular at $\lambda = -k\alpha$.

Proof. If k is an integer, then ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(1_{-k\alpha})) = \{0\}$ by [17], Proposition 4.3. If $k \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{N}$, then $E_\Lambda^1(1_{-k\alpha}) = \{0\}$ by (87) and Lemma 6.6. Thus in any case $E_\Lambda^+(1_{-k\alpha}) = \{0\}$. $\square$

7 Applications and related results

7.1 Vanishing results

Let Γ be a nontrivial torsion-free convex cocompact subgroup acting on $\mathbb{R}H^n$. We define the real number $d_\Gamma \in [0, n-1]$ by $\delta_\Gamma + \rho = d_\Gamma \alpha$. Now Theorem 5.5 combined with the vanishing result Corollary 4.13 has the immediate

Corollary 7.1 *Let (φ, V_φ) be a finite-dimensional unitary representation of Γ . Then*

$$H^p(\Gamma, V_\varphi) = \{0\} \quad \text{for all } p > d_\Gamma + 1 .$$

Proof. Indeed, if $p > d_\Gamma + 1$, then $(p-1)\alpha - \rho > \delta_\Gamma$. □

This result is neither new nor the best possible. By the celebrated result of Patterson [56] and Sullivan [65] the number d_Γ is equal to the Hausdorff dimension of the limit set Λ . Using this and methods from algebraic topology Izeki [38] proved

Proposition 7.2 ([38], Prop. 4.13) *The cohomological dimension of Γ is at most $d_\Gamma + 1$. In particular, for any (not necessarily finite-dimensional) representation (φ, V_φ) of Γ we have*

$$H^p(\Gamma, V_\varphi) = \{0\} \quad \text{for all } p > d_\Gamma + 1 .$$

Nevertheless, it seems to be interesting that this topological statement has an analytic proof at least in the interesting case of the trivial Γ -representation which, moreover, does not use the relation between the critical exponent and the Hausdorff dimension of the limit set.

We remark (compare [38], Thm. 4.15) that in view of the exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow H^p(Y) \rightarrow H^p(B) \rightarrow H^{p+1}(\bar{Y}, B) \rightarrow \dots$$

Proposition 7.2 as well as Corollary 7.1 combined with Poincaré-Lefschetz duality implies Nayatani's vanishing theorem [52]

$$H^p(B) = 0 \quad \text{for all } p \in (d_\Gamma + 1, n - 2 - d_\Gamma) .$$

This yields a cohomology free region if $\delta_\Gamma < -\alpha$ for odd n and $\delta_\Gamma < -\frac{3}{2}\alpha$ for even n .

We can sharpen Proposition 7.2 for Γ -representations of the form $F \otimes V_\varphi$, where φ is unitary and F is a finite-dimensional representation of G .

Proposition 7.3 *Let F be an irreducible finite-dimensional representation with highest weight $(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor})$ as in Section 6. Set*

$$p_F := \min\{i \mid m_i = 0\} \in \left\{0, 1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\}$$

(for this definition we set $m_i = 0$ for $i > \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$). Let (φ, V_φ) be a finite-dimensional unitary representation of Γ . Then

$$H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) = \{0\} \quad \text{for all } p > \min\{d_\Gamma + 1, n - p_F\}.$$

If Γ is cocompact, then $H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) \neq \{0\}$ only if $p \in [p_F, n - p_F]$.

Proof. Let $p = n - k$, where $k < p_F$. Then $m_k \neq 0$. We look at the associated M -representation σ_F^k with highest weight $\mu_k = (\tilde{m}_1, \dots, \tilde{m}_{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor})$ and the associated element $\lambda_k \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ introduced in Section 6. Before Proposition 4.24 we assigned to σ_F^k an element $\lambda_{\sigma_F^k} \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ which specifies the end of the corresponding complementary series. If $k = \frac{n-1}{2}$ we replace the index k by $\text{sign}(m_k) \in \{\pm\}$. If $k = 0$, then $\lambda_k = \rho + m_0 > \rho \geq \lambda_{\sigma_F^k}$. If $k \geq 1$, then $|\tilde{m}_k| = m_{k-1} + 1 \neq 0$. It follows that $\lambda_{\sigma_F^k} \leq \rho - k\alpha < \rho + (|m_k| - k\alpha) = \lambda_k$. In any case $\lambda_k > \lambda_{\sigma_F^k}$. Proposition 4.24 now yields ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_k}^k, \varphi)) = \{0\}$. Hence $H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) = \{0\}$ by Theorem 6.3.

That $H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$ vanishes for $p > d_\Gamma + 1$ is clear from Proposition 7.2. Note, however, that for $\delta_\Gamma \geq -\frac{\alpha}{2}$ it is not necessary to refer to Proposition 7.2. Indeed, in this case $p > d_\Gamma + 1$ implies $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$ which yields

$$\lambda_{n-p} \geq \rho - (n-p)\alpha = (p-1)\alpha - \rho > \delta_\Gamma.$$

It again follows that ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_k}^k, \varphi)) = \{0\} = H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$. $\square$

Note that the above proof relies on two essential facts. First, that the cohomology in degrees $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$ is related to a specific irreducible representation $I^{\sigma_F^{n-p}, \lambda_{n-p}}$ of G with infinitesimal character χ_F , and second, that the cohomology can only be non-zero if $I^{\sigma_F^{n-p}, \lambda_{n-p}}$ is unitary. The point is that one precisely knows the parameters, where this happens.

For cocompact Γ the result has been known before. This case is usually investigated in the framework of $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -cohomology of irreducible unitary Harish-Chandra modules (see [11], [68], Ch. 9, in particular Theorem 9.5.8, [67]; compare Section 9). For cocompact Γ and generic F , i.e. $m_i \neq 0$ for all i , the proposition means that the cohomology is concentrated in the middle degree or vanishes, if n is even or odd, respectively.

7.2 Cohomology with compact support

As in the Section 5 we consider a hyperbolic manifold $Y = \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{R}H^n$, where Γ is convex cocompact, and a finite-dimensional Γ -representation (φ, V_φ) . Here we want to relate the cohomology

with compact support $H_c^p(Y, E(\varphi))$ with invariant currents supported on the limit set. Note that $E(\varphi)$ extends naturally to $\bar{Y}$: $E(\varphi) := \Gamma \backslash ((X \cup \Omega) \times V_\varphi)$. We use the identification $H_c^p(Y, E(\varphi)) \cong H^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi))$, where $H^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi))$ denotes the relative cohomology of $\bar{Y}$ with respect to its boundary B . For simplicity we only treat the case of even n . In this case the complex (59) computes $H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) \cong H^p(\bar{Y}, E(\varphi))$. Thus res induces a map $res_p : H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(B, E(\varphi))$. One expects that res_p coincides with the natural map $i_p^* : H^p(\bar{Y}, E(\varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(B, E(\varphi))$ induced by the embedding $B \hookrightarrow \bar{Y}$. This is indeed the case, see Proposition 7.5. Thus the cohomology of the complex of kernels of res , i.e.

$$(\Gamma[\Omega_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi], d) \text{ completed by } {}^\Gamma V_\varphi ,$$

should be related to $H^p(Y, B, E(\varphi))$. We will clarify this relation in Proposition 7.6. That these two cohomology groups are not isomorphic in general is caused by the lack of surjectivity of res . However, for unitary φ and $p \leq \frac{n}{2}$ they are isomorphic.

For any Γ -module V we denote by $C_\Gamma^* V$ the standard group cohomology complex:

$$C_\Gamma^p V := \{f : \Gamma^{p+1} \rightarrow V \mid f(\gamma\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma\gamma_p) = \gamma f(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_p)\}$$

with differential

$$\partial_p f(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{p+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{p+1} (-1)^i f(\gamma_0, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_i, \dots, \gamma_{p+1}) .$$

Then $H^p(C_\Gamma^* V) = H^p(\Gamma, V)$. If V^* is a complex of Γ -modules, then $C_\Gamma^* V^*$ should denote the total complex of the arising double complex. There is a natural embedding of complexes

$$c : {}^\Gamma V^* \hookrightarrow C_\Gamma^* V^*$$

sending ${}^\Gamma V^p$ to the constant functions in $C_\Gamma^0 V^p$. If V^* is a complex of acyclic Γ -modules, then c is a quasi-isomorphism. If $\Phi : V^* \rightarrow W^*$ is a quasi-isomorphism of complexes of Γ -modules, then $C_\Gamma^* \Phi : C_\Gamma^* V^* \rightarrow C_\Gamma^* W^*$ is a quasi-isomorphism, too.

We will denote the completed de Rham complex (compare (59))

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega_{-\omega}^0(\partial X) \xrightarrow{d} \Omega_{-\omega}^1(\partial X) \xrightarrow{d} \dots \xrightarrow{d} \Omega_{-\omega}^{n-1}(\partial X) \xrightarrow{\int_{\partial X}} \mathbb{C} \rightarrow 0$$

by $\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X)$.

Lemma 7.4 *The embedding $c : {}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \rightarrow C_\Gamma^*({}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi))$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. Since the Γ -modules $\Omega^p(X) \otimes V_\varphi$ are acyclic ([14], Lemma 2.4), the embedding

$$c_X : {}^\Gamma(\Omega^*(X) \otimes V_\varphi) = \Omega^*(Y, E(\varphi)) \hookrightarrow C_\Gamma^*({}^\Gamma(\Omega^*(X) \otimes V_\varphi))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. As already noted, by Theorem 5.1 suitably normalized Poisson transforms define a quasi-isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} P : \dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi &\rightarrow \Omega^*(X) \otimes V_\varphi , \\ {}^\Gamma P : {}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) &\rightarrow \Omega^*(Y, E(\varphi)) . \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $C_\Gamma P : C_\Gamma^*(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \rightarrow C_\Gamma^*(\Omega^*(X) \otimes V_\varphi)$ is a quasi-isomorphism, too. We have $C_\Gamma P \circ c = c_X \circ {}^\Gamma P$. It follows that c is a quasi-isomorphism. $\square$

The precise normalization of the Poisson transform $P : \dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi \rightarrow \Omega^*(X) \otimes V_\varphi$ is given as follows. For $p = 0, \dots, n-1$ set $c_p := \frac{(n-1)(n-3)\dots(n-2p+1)}{(n-1)(n-2)\dots(n-p)}$. Then

$$P|_{\Omega^p(X) \otimes V_\varphi} := c_p P_{p, \rho-p\alpha} \otimes \text{id}, \quad p = 0, 1, \dots, n-1; \quad P|_{\dot{\Omega}^n(X) \otimes V_\varphi} := c_{n-1} \frac{1-n}{|\alpha|^n} \text{vol}_X \otimes \text{id}.$$

Proposition 7.5 *We consider the embeddings $i : B \rightarrow \bar{Y}$ and $j : Y \rightarrow \bar{Y}$ and the restriction map $\text{res} : {}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \rightarrow \Omega_{-\omega}^*(B, E(\varphi))$. Here res is defined to be zero on $\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi$. Then the following diagram commutes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^p \left({}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \right) & \xrightarrow{({}^\Gamma P)_p} & H^p(Y, E(\varphi)) \\ & \uparrow j_p^* & \\ & H^p(\bar{Y}, E(\varphi)) & \\ & \downarrow i_p^* & \\ H^p(\Omega_{-\omega}^*(B, E(\varphi))) & = & H^p(B, E(\varphi)) \end{array}$$

$({}^\Gamma P)_p$ and j_p^* are isomorphisms.

Proof. We also consider the embeddings $I : \Omega \rightarrow X \cup \Omega$ and $J : X \rightarrow X \cup \Omega$. V_φ can be embedded as the subcomplex of constant 0-forms into any V_φ -valued de Rham complex. In particular, the embeddings $V_\varphi \hookrightarrow \Omega^*(X) \otimes V_\varphi$, $V_\varphi \hookrightarrow \Omega^*(X \cup \Omega) \otimes V_\varphi$, and $V_\varphi \hookrightarrow \dot{\Omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi$ are quasi-isomorphisms. We look at the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \Omega^*(Y, E(\varphi)) & \xleftarrow{{}^\Gamma P} & {}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) & \xrightarrow{\text{res}} & \Omega_{-\omega}^*(B, E(\varphi)) & & \\ & & \downarrow c & & \downarrow c_B & & \\ & & C_\Gamma^*(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) & \xrightarrow{C_\Gamma \text{res}_\Omega} & C_\Gamma^*(\Omega_{-\omega}^*(\Omega) \otimes V_\varphi) & & \\ \downarrow c_X & \swarrow C_\Gamma P & \uparrow C_\Gamma^* V_\varphi & \nearrow & \uparrow & & \\ C_\Gamma^*(\Omega^*(X) \otimes V_\varphi) & \xleftarrow{\quad} & C_\Gamma^*(\Omega^*(X \cup \Omega) \otimes V_\varphi) & \xrightarrow{C_\Gamma I^*} & C_\Gamma^*(\Omega^*(\Omega) \otimes V_\varphi) & & \\ \uparrow c_X & \nwarrow C_\Gamma J^* & \downarrow & & \downarrow c_B & & \\ \Omega^*(Y, E(\varphi)) & \xleftarrow{j^*} & \Omega^*(\bar{Y}, E(\varphi)) & \xrightarrow{i^*} & \Omega^*(B, E(\varphi)) & & \end{array} \quad (88)$$

Using Lemma 7.4 and the Γ -acyclicity of $\Omega^p(X) \otimes V_\varphi$, $\Omega^p(X \cup \Omega) \otimes V_\varphi$, $\Omega^p(\Omega) \otimes V_\varphi$ ([14], Lemma 2.4), and $\Omega_{-\omega}^p(\Omega) \otimes V_\varphi$ (Lemma 8.8 below) we see that all vertical arrows and all arrows pointing to the left are quasi-isomorphisms. The left and the right column induce the identity on $H^p(Y, E(\varphi))$ and $H^p(B, E(\varphi))$, respectively. The proposition now follows from the observation that all subdiagrams of (88) commute. $\square$

The image $\text{im } res$ of the restriction map $res : {}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \rightarrow \Omega_{-\omega}^*(B, E(\varphi))$ is a subcomplex of $\Omega_{-\omega}^*(B, E(\varphi))$. Let $\text{coker } res$ denote the corresponding quotient complex.

Proposition 7.6 *The cohomology of the finite-dimensional complex ${}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi)$ of invariant currents supported on the limit set fits into the following long exact sequence:*

$$\begin{aligned} \dots &\rightarrow H^{p-2}(\text{coker } res) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^p({}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi)) \rightarrow H^{p-1}(\text{coker } res) \\ &\xrightarrow{\delta} H^{p+1}({}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi)) \rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

The map δ can be described as follows. Let $[\eta] \in H^{p-2}(\text{coker } res)$ be represented by $\eta \in \Omega_{-\omega}^{p-2}(B, E(\varphi))$ such that $d\eta = res(\omega)$ for some $\omega \in {}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^{p-1}(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi)$. Then $\delta[\eta] = [d\omega] \in H^p({}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi))$.

Proof. We form the mapping cone $(C^*(res), d)$ which is given by

$$C^p(res) = {}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^p(\partial X) \otimes V_\varphi) \oplus \Omega_{-\omega}^{p-1}(B, E(\varphi)) , \quad d(\omega, \eta) = (d\omega, res(\omega) - d\eta) .$$

Proposition 7.5 implies that it is quasi-isomorphic to the mapping cone $C^*(i^*)$, $i^* : \Omega^*(\bar{Y}, E(\varphi)) \rightarrow \Omega^*(B, E(\varphi))$. The cohomology of $C^*(i^*)$ is equal to $H^*(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi))$. Thus

$$H^p(C^*(res)) \cong H^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi)) . \quad (89)$$

We consider the exact sequence of complexes

$$0 \rightarrow {}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi) \rightarrow C^*(res) \rightarrow D^*(res) \rightarrow 0 , \quad (90)$$

where $D^p(res) := \text{im } res^p \oplus \Omega^{p-1}(B, E(\varphi))$, $d(\omega, \eta) = (d\omega, \omega - d\eta)$. It is now easy to check that the map $D^p(res) \ni (\omega, \eta) \mapsto (-1)^p[\eta] \in \text{coker } res^{p-1}$ defines a quasi-isomorphism between $D^*(res)$ and $(\text{coker } res)[1]$. This together with (89) and the long exact sequence associated to (90) implies the proposition. $\square$

Let $Z_\Lambda^p(\varphi)$ be the space of p -cocycles of ${}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi)$ as in Section 5.

Corollary 7.7 *If φ is unitary and $p \leq \frac{n}{2}$, then the map $Z_\Lambda^p(\varphi) \rightarrow H^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi))$ given by Proposition 7.6 is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Proposition 4.21 implies for all $q < p$ that $\text{coker } res^q = 0$ and that ${}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^q(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi) = Z_\Lambda^q(\varphi)$. Thus $H^p({}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi))$ is an isomorphism and $H^p({}^\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes V_\varphi)) = Z_\Lambda^p(\varphi)$. $\square$

For $p \leq \frac{n}{2}$ and general φ one can describe the map $Z_\Lambda^p(\varphi) \rightarrow H^*(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi))$ more explicitly. The standard relative cohomology complex $\Omega^*(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi))$ for the pair $(\bar{Y}, B)$ is given by

$$\Omega^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi)) := \{\omega \in \Omega^p(\bar{Y}, E(\varphi)) \mid i^*\omega = 0\} .$$

Indeed, the natural embedding $\Omega^*(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi)) \hookrightarrow C^*(i^*)$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Using the asymptotic behaviour for $a \rightarrow \infty$ of $P_{p, \rho - p\alpha}\omega(ka)$, $\omega \in Z_\Lambda^p(\varphi)$, $kM \in \Omega$ ([14], Lemma 6.2, Equation (37)) it is not difficult to show that $c_p P_{p, \rho - p\alpha}\omega$ defines an element in $\Omega^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi))$ (this is not true for $p > \frac{n}{2}$), which is closed and represents the correct cohomology class in $H^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\varphi))$.

Let (π, F) be an irreducible finite-dimensional representation of G . Proposition 7.6 in particular yields a map

$$r_p : Z_\Lambda^p(\pi \otimes \varphi) \rightarrow H^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) .$$

Corollary 7.8 *Let $D_\pi : Z_{F, \Lambda}^p(\varphi) \rightarrow Z_\Lambda^p(\pi \otimes \varphi)$ be the embedding constructed in Proposition 6.1. If n is even, φ is unitary, and $p \leq \frac{n}{2}$, then*

$$r_p \circ D_\pi : Z_{F, \Lambda}^p(\varphi) \rightarrow H^p(\bar{Y}, B, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. By the argument at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 6.3 and since the complex of sheaves $\Omega_{-\omega}^*(\cdot, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F} = C^{-\omega}(\cdot, V_B(\sigma_{F, \lambda_*}^*, \varphi))$ on B is a flabby resolution of the sheaf of parallel sections of $E(\pi \otimes \varphi)$ on B Proposition 7.5 applied $\pi \otimes \varphi$ remains true if we replace $\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\omega}^*(\partial X) \otimes F \otimes V_\varphi)$ by (77) and $\Omega_{-\omega}^*(B, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ by $C^{-\omega}(B, V_B(\sigma_{F, \lambda_*}^*, \varphi))$. Thus we can also replace in Proposition 7.6 the complexes $\Gamma(\dot{\Omega}_{-\infty}^*(\Lambda) \otimes F \otimes V_\varphi)$ and $\text{coker } res$ by their subcomplexes having infinitesimal character χ_F . Now one can argue as in the proof of Corollary 7.7. $\square$

7.3 The Harder-Borel conjecture

Let G be a connected real reductive group, $K \subset G$ be a maximal compact subgroup, $\Gamma \subset G$ be a finitely generated discrete subgroup. Let (π, F) and (φ, V_φ) be finite-dimensional representations of G and Γ , respectively. We assume that F is irreducible, hence has infinitesimal character χ_F . If Γ is cocompact, we require φ to be unitary. One would like to study the cohomology groups

$$H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$$

by means of complexes of *automorphic* differential forms. Of course, the de Rham complex

$$\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) := \Gamma(\Omega^*(X) \otimes F \otimes V_\varphi)$$

computes these cohomology groups. If Γ is torsion-free, then $Y := \Gamma \backslash X$ is a manifold, and this complex is the de Rham complex associated to the flat vector bundle $E(\pi \otimes \varphi)$ as considered in Section 2. By Selberg's Lemma (see e.g. [59]) there is always a torsion-free normal subgroup

$\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma$ of finite index. Then the finite group Γ/Γ_0 acts on the manifold $Y_0 := \Gamma_0 \backslash X$, and we have

$$\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) = {}^{\Gamma/\Gamma_0} \Omega^*(Y_0, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) , \quad (91)$$

$$H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi) = {}^{\Gamma/\Gamma_0} H^p(\Gamma_0, F \otimes V_\varphi) . \quad (92)$$

These equations show that up to an action of a finite group, which is harmless, we are still in the situation of the preceding sections.

Fix a G -invariant Riemannian metric on $X = G/K$ and an admissible positive definite scalar product on F : it has to be K -invariant and the Iwasawa $\mathfrak{a}$ has to act by selfadjoint endomorphisms. By the usual twisting isomorphism we look at $X \times F \cong G \times_K F$ as a G -homogeneous vector bundle on X which now comes with a G -invariant Hermitian metric. It induces a Hermitian metric on $\Lambda^p T^*Y \otimes E(\pi)$ and thus gives rise to a codifferential

$$\delta = \delta_F : \Omega^{p+1}(Y, E(\pi)) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E(\pi))$$

and a corresponding Laplacian

$$\Delta_F = \delta_F d + d \delta_F : \Omega^p(Y, E(\pi)) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E(\pi))$$

as in Section 2. The codifferential δ_F can be twisted with the flat connection of $E(\varphi)$ as in (7), and we obtain operators

$$\delta_F : \Omega^{p+1}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) , \quad \Delta_F = \delta_F d + d \delta_F : \Omega^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \rightarrow \Omega^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) .$$

A form $\omega \in \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is said to have moderate growth, if for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exist constants C, r such that with respect to some chosen norm on V_φ

$$|\Delta_F^k \omega(x)| \leq C e^{r \text{dist}(x, eK)} .$$

The G -action on $\Omega^*(X) \otimes F$ induces an action of the center $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ of the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ on $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$. In particular, it makes sense to say that a form has generalized infinitesimal character. Note that the Casimir operator acts by $-\Delta_F + \kappa_F$. Let us introduce the following subcomplexes of $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$:

- $\Omega_{mg}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ (forms of moderate growth)
- $\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) := \Omega_{mg}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F}$ (automorphic forms)
- $\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) := \mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \cap \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))_{\Delta_F, \delta_F}$ (coclosed harmonic automorphic forms)

Here, as in Section 6, the superscript χ_F means forms having generalized infinitesimal character χ_F . Some comments concerning these definitions are in order. First, the definition of moderate

growth given here is slightly stronger than the one given in Section 5. This is necessary in order to make $\Omega_{mg}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ into a complex. $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F}$ is a subcomplex of $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))_{(\Delta_F)}$. This shows that the weaker definition of moderate growth would lead to the same space of automorphic forms. The Harder-Borel conjecture, following Gaillard [32], now asserts

Conjecture 7.9 *The inclusions $\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \subset \mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \subset \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ are quasi-isomorphisms.*

For cocompact Γ we observe $\Omega_{mg}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) = \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ and thus Conjecture 7.9 is a direct consequence of classical Hodge theory.

The conjecture arose in the work of Harder, Borel and others (see e.g. [8] and the survey article [63]) on the cohomology of arithmetic subgroups of reductive algebraic groups which is in fact the most interesting case. Here one usually considers the case of trivial φ , only. Indeed, in this situation (or more generally, if $\Gamma \backslash G$ has finite volume) $\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi))$ in contrast to $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi))_{\Delta_F, \delta_F}$ is finite-dimensional and carries a lot of additional structure. However, it is at least of theoretical interest to understand the generality in which statements like Conjecture 7.9 hold. Gaillard [32] formulates and discusses a corresponding conjecture for trivial π and φ , but for a discrete subgroup of an arbitrary connected Lie group.

The most far reaching result concerning Conjecture 7.9 known up to now is the following

Theorem 7.10 (Franke [28]) *Let G be reductive algebraic defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, $\Gamma \subset G$ be a congruence subgroup. Let (π, F) be a rational representation of G . Then the inclusion $\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi)) \subset \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi))$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

For G of $\mathbb{Q}$ -rank one the result was previously obtained by Speh and Casselman, see [24] for a discussion of the case $G = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$. Compare also Harder's early results [34]. For G of general rank it is not known whether the inclusion $\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi)) \subset \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi))$ is a quasi-isomorphism. However, [18], Theorem 6.3 implies

Proposition 7.11 *If G has real rank one, $\Gamma \subset G$ has finite covolume, and φ is trivial, then Conjecture 7.9 holds true.*

We will shortly discuss the proof of the proposition in order to indicate what kind of results one could try to prove if one wants to establish Conjecture 7.9. First of all one needs that $\Omega_{mg}^*(Y, E(\pi))$ is quasi-isomorphic to $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi))$. This was shown by Borel [7] (compare also [8], [18], Theorem 5.6, [28], Section 2.3). Now one looks at the image of the Laplacian

$$\Delta_F = -\Omega + \kappa_F : \Omega_{mg}^p(Y, E(\pi)) \rightarrow \Omega_{mg}^p(Y, E(\pi)) .$$

[18], Theorem 6.3 tells us that it is the orthogonal complement of rapidly decreasing harmonic forms, which are automatically closed and coclosed. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 we find that the complexes $\Omega_{mg}^*(Y, E(\pi))_{(\Delta_F)}$ and $\Omega_{mg}^*(Y, E(\pi))_{\Delta_F, \delta_F}$ are quasi-isomorphic to $\Omega_{mg}^*(Y, E(\pi))$. The rank one assumption now ensures that the action of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ on these complexes is locally finite. Thus taking the components with generalized infinitesimal character χ_F does not change the cohomology (see the proof of Proposition 6.3). This completes the proof of Proposition 7.11.

One could try to extend this approach to, say, convex cocompact or even geometrically finite discrete subgroups of rank one Lie groups. It seems to be not too difficult to establish that $\Omega_{mg}^*(Y, E(\pi))$ is quasi-isomorphic to $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi))$. However, the determination of the image of the Laplacian on forms of moderate growth seems to be out of reach in the moment. The crucial point is to show that the Laplacian has closed range.

However, if $G = SO(1, n)_0$ or $G = Spin(1, n)$ and Γ is convex cocompact, then we can use Theorem 6.3 and or rather the tools developed for its proof in order to establish Conjecture 7.9.

Theorem 7.12 *If $G = SO(1, n)_0$ or $G = Spin(1, n)$ and Γ is convex cocompact, then Conjecture 7.9 is true.*

For the special case of elementary Γ (and $\pi = \varphi = 1$) the theorem was previously obtained by Delacroix [27]. The proof of the theorem will proceed in several steps. For cocompact Γ there is nothing to show. We thus assume Γ to be non-cocompact. In view of (91) and (92) we may also assume Γ to be torsion-free.

We introduce close relatives of the complexes $\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ and $\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ which can be directly investigated by means of Theorem 6.3 and which coincide with the original ones in case of trivial π . Recall the definitions of the codifferential $\hat{\delta}$ and the corresponding Laplacian $\hat{\Delta}$ from Section 2. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &:= \mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \cap \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})} , \\ \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &:= \mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \cap \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))_{\hat{\Delta}, \hat{\delta}} . \end{aligned}$$

These complexes of automorphic forms are as natural as the corresponding unhatted versions. We will first prove the analog of Conjecture 7.9 for them (see Propositions 7.14 and 7.17 below).

The following observation holds for any discrete subgroup Γ of a real reductive group G .

Lemma 7.13 *The inclusion $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \subset \mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. $\hat{\Delta}$ defines a G -invariant differential operator acting on $\Omega^*(X, E(\pi)) = \Omega^*(X) \otimes F$. The algebra of G -invariant differential operators acting on a homogeneous vector bundle on

X is a finitely generated module over $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$. This implies that $\mathbb{C}[\hat{\Delta}]$ acts locally finitely on $\Omega^*(X, E(\pi))^{\chi_F}$, thus also on $\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$. As in (70) we obtain a direct sum decomposition

$$\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) = \hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \oplus \mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))_R, \quad (93)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))_R$ is the sum of all generalized eigenspaces of $\hat{\Delta}$ corresponding to non-zero eigenvalues. From this the lemma follows easily. $\square$

Note that there is no similar simple relation between $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ and $\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$. In particular, $\hat{\Delta}$ and δ_F do not commute, hence $\hat{\Delta}$ does not act on $\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$.

We now return to the case of convex cocompact Γ acting on $\mathbb{R}H^n$.

Proposition 7.14 *The inclusion $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \subset \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. It is clear that this inclusion induces an isomorphism on H^0 . Let $p > 0$. Then by Proposition 5.3 and Proposition 6.1 the space $Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ of p -cocycles of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is isomorphic to ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$. For $l \geq k_-(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} E_{-\infty}^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) &:= \text{ext}[l] \left(C^{-\infty}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) \\ &= E^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) \cap C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)). \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.5 we find that

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E_{-\infty}^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) \cong {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E_{\Lambda}^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi).$$

We obtain the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E_{-\infty}^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) & \xleftarrow{a} & {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) / E_{\Lambda}^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) \\ \downarrow b & & \downarrow c \\ H^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))) & \xrightarrow{i} & H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_{\varphi}). \end{array}$$

By Theorem 6.3 the map c is an isomorphism. Since a is an isomorphism, b is surjective, and $c = i \circ b \circ a$, we conclude that i (as well as b) is an isomorphism. The proposition follows. $\square$

Proposition 7.14 together with Lemma 7.13 shows that the inclusion $\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \subset \Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is a quasi-isomorphism which proves the first half of Theorem 7.12.

Lemma 7.15 $E_{-\infty}^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) = \varrho_{\Gamma} \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right).$

Proof. We set $E' := \varrho_\Gamma \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right)$. As in Lemma 4.18 we obtain for $k \geq k_-(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)$

$$E_{-\infty}^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) = \varrho_\Gamma^k \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) \subset E' .$$

On the other hand we have by Corollary 5.4 and Corollary 6.2

$$E' \subset \text{im} \varrho_\Gamma \cap C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) = E_{-\infty}^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi) .$$

The lemma follows. $\square$

Corollary 7.16 $H^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))) \cong Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))/\hat{\Delta} \left(Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))) \right) .$

Proof. For $p = 0$ the assertion is obvious. If $p > 0$, then the space on the right hand side is isomorphic to (compare Corollary 5.4)

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))/\varrho_\Gamma \left({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)) \right) ,$$

which in turn is equal to

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))/E_{-\infty}^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)$$

by Lemma 7.15. The latter quotient is isomorphic to $H^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ via the map b appearing in the proof of Proposition 7.14. $\square$

Proposition 7.17 *The inclusion $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \subset \hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. We first prove injectivity. Let $\omega \in Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ such that $[\omega] = 0$ in $H^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$. By Corollary 7.16 there exists an element $\psi \in Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ such that

$$\omega = \hat{\Delta} \psi = d(\hat{\delta} \psi) .$$

Now $\hat{\delta} \psi \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{F, ch}^{p-1}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$, hence $[\omega] = 0$ in $H^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$.

Y is orientable. Therefore there is a Hodge- $*$ -operator on $\Omega^*(Y)$. It induces an operator

$$* := * \otimes \text{id}_{E(\pi \otimes \varphi)} : \hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^{n-p}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$$

satisfying

$$*^2 = (-1)^{p(n-1)} \text{id} , \quad \hat{\delta} = (-1)^{p(n-1)+1} * d * , \quad * \hat{\Delta} = \hat{\Delta} * .$$

Now we can prove surjectivity. Let $\omega \in Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$. We want to find an element $\eta \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^{p-1}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ such that $\hat{\delta}(\omega - d\eta) = 0$. The element $\phi = *\hat{\delta}\omega$ is exact in $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$. Thus by Corollary 7.16 we have $\phi = \hat{\Delta}\psi$ for some $\psi \in Z^{n+1-p}(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$. Now $\eta = (-1)^{(p-1)(n-1)} * \psi$ does the job. This finishes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Note that by the results of Section 6 the space of cocycles $Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ is isomorphic to $Z_F^{n-p}(\varphi) \cap C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$. The surjectivity assertion could also have been proved by showing that $Z_F^{n-p}(\varphi) \cap C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$ is dense in $Z_F^{n-p}(\varphi)$. This is indeed possible by a refinement of the proof of Corollary 3.16.

Proposition 7.17, while interesting in its own right, has no direct impact for the proof of Theorem 7.12 (except for the case $\pi = 1$). However, we will use the technique employed in its proof in order to show that the inclusion $\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \subset \mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is a quasi-isomorphism. For this we need the following analogue of Corollary 7.16

Lemma 7.18 $H^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))) \cong Z^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))/\Delta_F(Z^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))))$.

Proof. We employ the decomposition (93) which is stable under the action of $\mathbb{C}[\Delta_F]$. For $p > 0$ the space $Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ is isomorphic to ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi))$. Using that $\Delta_F = -\Omega + \kappa_F$ we find as in the proof of Corollary 5.4 that this isomorphism sends $\Delta_F(Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))))$ to ${}_{\varrho_\Gamma}({}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)))$ which is isomorphic to $\hat{\Delta}(Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))))$. Now Lemma 7.13 and Corollary 7.16 imply

$$H^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))) \cong Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))/\Delta_F(Z^p(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))))$$

Thus it remains to show that

$$\Delta_F : Z^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))_R) \rightarrow Z^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))_R)$$

is surjective.

In the same way as Corollary 5.4 has been derived from Theorem 5.1 one shows that

$$Z^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))_R) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_+^* \setminus \{\pm((p-1)\alpha - \rho)\}} {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda^{n-p}, \pi \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F}. \quad (94)$$

The sum on the right hand side is finite. It is therefore sufficient to show that

$$A := -\Omega_F + \kappa_F : {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda^{n-p}, \pi \otimes \varphi)) \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda^{n-p}, \pi \otimes \varphi)) \quad (95)$$

is surjective for all λ appearing in (94).

As in the proof of Proposition 6.1 we see that the G -representations $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\mu^{n-p}, \pi))$ have composition series with composition factors of the form $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{\mu'(\mu)}^{n-p}, \pi))$. Therefore there exist pairwise different non-zero polynomials p_i on $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$ and natural numbers k_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, such that $\prod_{i=1}^r (A - p_i(\mu))^{k_i}$ acts by zero on $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\mu^{n-p}, \pi \otimes \varphi))$.

Then we can find non-zero polynomials $q_i \in \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*][x]$, $b_i \in \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*]$ such that

$$xq_i(x, \mu) \prod_{j \neq i} (x - p_j(\mu))^{k_j} \equiv b_i(\mu) \pmod{(x - p_i(\mu))^{k_i}} .$$

We now introduce a rational family Q_μ on $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ of operators in $\mathbb{C}[A]$ by

$$Q_\mu = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{q_i(A, \mu)}{b_i(\mu)} \prod_{j \neq i} (A - p_j(\mu))^{k_j} .$$

We now fix λ appearing in (94). For μ in a pointed neighbourhood of λ the family Q_μ is regular and we have

$$AQ_\mu f_\mu = f_\mu , \quad f_\mu \in C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\mu^{n-p}, \pi \otimes \varphi)) . \quad (96)$$

Recall the definition of $I_\sigma^{wr,-}$ from Section 4. For $\sigma = \sigma^{n-p}$ one checks that

$$I_\sigma^{wr,-} \cap \mathfrak{a}_+^* = \begin{cases} \emptyset & p = 1, n \\ \{(p-1)\alpha - \rho\} & \frac{n+1}{2} \leq p \leq n-1 \\ \{\rho - (p-1)\alpha\} & 2 \leq p \leq \frac{n}{2} \end{cases} .$$

Thus all the pairs (σ^{n-p}, λ) occurring in (94) are not special. Proposition 4.11 implies that

$${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda^{n-p}, \pi \otimes \varphi)) = E_{-\infty}^+(\sigma_\lambda^{n-p}, \pi \otimes \varphi) .$$

Let now $f \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda^{n-p}, \pi \otimes \varphi))$. Arguing as in the proof of Corollary 4.15 we find a family $f_\mu \in {}^\Gamma \mathcal{M}_\lambda C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\mu, \pi \otimes \varphi))$ such that $f = ev(f_\mu)$. Then

$$g := ev(Q_\mu f_\mu) \in {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda^{n-p}, \pi \otimes \varphi))$$

satisfies $Ag = f$ in view of (96). This proves the desired surjectivity. $\square$

In order to finish the proof of Theorem 7.9 it remains to show

Proposition 7.19 *The inclusion $\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \subset \mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. We will argue similarly as in the proof of Proposition 7.17. The proof of injectivity is straightforward. Indeed, let $\omega \in Z^p(\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ such that $[\omega] = 0$ in $H^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$. By Lemma 7.18 there exists an element $\psi \in Z^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ such that

$$\omega = \Delta_F \psi = d(\delta_F \psi) .$$

Now $\delta_F \psi \in \mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^{p-1}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$, hence $[\omega] = 0$ in $H^p(\mathcal{A}_{F, ch}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$.

The proof of surjectivity needs a little preparation. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ be the Cartan decomposition. Let $(r, C^\infty(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi))$ be the G -representation given by

$$C^\infty(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) := \{f : G \rightarrow V_\varphi \mid f(gx) = \varphi(g)f(x) \ \forall g \in \Gamma, x \in G\}, \quad (r(g)f)(x) := f(xg).$$

Then one can identify $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ with $[C^\infty(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^* \mathfrak{p}^*]^K$. Any element $X \in \mathfrak{p}$ defines operators $\varepsilon(X) : \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}^* \rightarrow \Lambda^{p+1} \mathfrak{p}^*$ and $i(X) : \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}^* \rightarrow \Lambda^{p-1} \mathfrak{p}^*$ given by $\varepsilon(X)(\omega) = X^\sharp \wedge \omega$, where $X^\sharp$ is the 1-form corresponding to X via the invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{p}$, i.e. the Riemannian metric on Y , and $i(X)(\omega)(Y_1, \dots, Y_{p-1}) = \omega(X, Y_1, \dots, Y_{p-1})$. Let $X_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ be an orthogonal basis of $\mathfrak{p}$. Using the above identification we have

$$\begin{aligned} d &= \sum_{i=1}^n r(X_i) \otimes \text{id} \otimes \varepsilon(X_i) + \text{id} \otimes \pi(X_i) \otimes \varepsilon(X_i), \\ \delta_F &= \sum_{i=1}^n -r(X_i) \otimes \text{id} \otimes i(X_i) + \text{id} \otimes \pi(X_i) \otimes i(X_i), \\ \hat{\delta} &= \sum_{i=1}^n -r(X_i) \otimes \text{id} \otimes i(X_i) - \text{id} \otimes \pi(X_i) \otimes i(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\theta : G \rightarrow G$ be the Cartan involution. We define a new representation π^θ on F by $\pi^\theta(g) := \pi(\theta(g))$. F equipped with the representation π^θ will sometimes be denoted by F^θ . In particular, we have $\pi^\theta|_K = \pi|_K$, $\pi^\theta(X_i) = -\pi(X_i)$. Thus we can identify the bundle $E(\pi^\theta \otimes \varphi)$ with $E(\pi \otimes \varphi)$. This identification induces on $E(\pi \otimes \varphi)$ a second flat connection, and hence on $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ operators d_θ , δ_{F^θ} , and $\hat{\delta}_\theta$. The above formulas show that $\delta_F = \hat{\delta}_\theta$ and $\delta_{F^\theta} = \hat{\delta}$. In particular, $\delta_F = (-1)^{p(n-1)+1} * d_\theta *$. Note that for the corresponding Laplacians we have $\Delta_F = \Delta_{F^\theta}$, whereas in general $\hat{\Delta} \neq \hat{\Delta}_\theta$.

Let $B_\theta^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$, $Z_\theta^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ denote the spaces of p -coboundaries and p -cocycles of the complex $(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)), d_\theta)$, respectively. We will need the following

Lemma 7.20 $B_\theta^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))) = \Delta_{F^\theta}(Z_\theta^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))))$.

Proof. If $\pi^\theta \cong \pi$, i.e. $\chi_{F^\theta} = \chi_F$, then there exists a bundle automorphism of $E(\pi \otimes \varphi)$ which intertwines d_θ with d , δ_{F^θ} with δ_F . Thus in this case the lemma follows immediately from Lemma 7.18. In order to deal with the opposite case (which can occur for odd n , only) we observe that similarly to (94)

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\theta^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))) &\cong {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \pi^\theta \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F} \\ &\oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}_+^* \setminus \{ \pm((p-1)\alpha-\rho) \}} {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda^{n-p}, \pi^\theta \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F} \end{aligned}$$

for $p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$. If $p \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$ one has to replace $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \pi^\theta \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F}$ by $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0^\pm, \pi^\theta \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F}$.

We claim that if $\chi_{F^\theta} \neq \chi_F$, then $C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \pi^\theta \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F} = \{0\}$. Indeed, using Proposition 6.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \pi^\theta \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_F} &\subset C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \pi^\theta \otimes \varphi))^{\kappa_F} \\ &= C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \pi^\theta \otimes \varphi))^{\kappa_{F^\theta}} \\ &= C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_{(p-1)\alpha-\rho}^{n-p}, \pi^\theta \otimes \varphi))^{\chi_{F^\theta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the surjectivity of the operator A in (95) implies the lemma in this case, too. $\square$

Now we can prove surjectivity. Let $\omega \in Z^p(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$. We want to find an element $\eta \in \mathcal{A}_F^{p-1}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ such that $\delta_F(\omega - d\eta) = 0$. We have $*\delta_F\omega \in B_\theta^{n+1-p}(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$. Thus by Lemma 7.20 there exists $\psi \in Z_\theta^{n+1-p}(\mathcal{A}_F^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)))$ such that $*\delta_F\omega = \Delta_{F^\theta}\psi = d_\theta \hat{\delta}\psi$. Now $\eta = (-1)^{(p-1)(n-1)} * \psi$ does the job. This finishes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

8 Hyperfunctions on the limit set as coefficients

We return to the assumptions of Sections 3 and 4. That is, Γ is a discrete (torsion-free) convex cocompact subgroup of a linear rank one Lie group G . In the present section we want to study the cohomology of Γ with coefficients in the infinite-dimensional Γ -representations $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ and $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. Their invariants, i.e. the cohomology groups $H^0(\Gamma, \cdot)$, have been already investigated in Sections 4-6. In this section we want to understand the higher cohomology groups, too. At all places, where we use the extension operator ext_λ and the spaces $E^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ we have to assume that $X \neq \mathbb{O}H^2$ (or that $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$).

This study is motivated by the theory of the Selberg zeta function associated to an irreducible M -representation σ and a finite-dimensional Γ -representation φ . Note that any element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is conjugated in G to an element $m_\gamma a_\gamma \in MA^+$. Then for $\mu \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$, $\operatorname{Re}(\mu) > \delta_\Gamma + \delta_\varphi$, the Selberg zeta function can be defined by the infinite product

$$Z_{S,\sigma,\varphi}(\mu) := \prod_{[\gamma]} \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \det \left(\operatorname{id}_{V_\sigma \otimes S^k(\bar{\mathfrak{n}}) \otimes V_\varphi} - a_\gamma^{-2\rho}(\sigma_\mu \otimes S^k(\operatorname{Ad}_{|\bar{\mathfrak{n}})}))(m_\gamma a_\gamma) \otimes \varphi(\gamma) \right) .$$

Here the first product runs over all non-trivial primitive conjugacy classes of Γ , and S^k denotes the k -fold symmetric power. For a discussion of the geometric meaning of this formula we refer to [29], [15], [40]. It is a folklore theorem that $Z_{S,\sigma,\varphi}$ admits a meromorphic continuation to all of $\mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^*$. For cocompact Γ this has been proved by dynamical methods in [29] and at various places by trace formula methods (see [40], [15] and the literature cited therein). In the latter approach one has to assume φ to be unitary. The dynamical methods also work for the general convex cocompact case as has been explained in [58], Sect. 2, while the trace formula methods developed up to now (see [58], [22]) imply only that the logarithmic derivative of $Z_{S,\sigma,\varphi}$ is meromorphic. In [57] Patterson conjectured a precise relationship between the divisor of $Z_{S,\sigma,\varphi}$ (again for trivial φ) and the cohomology groups $H^*(\Gamma, C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$. Guided by the experience gained in the work [14], [19] on this conjecture we now state a slightly modified conjecture. Recall the definition of the natural number $k_+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ from Proposition 4.12.

Conjecture 8.1

- (i) *The cohomology groups $H^*(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$ and $H^*(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$ are finite-dimensional.*
- (ii) *The Euler characteristic satisfies $\chi(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*
- (iii) *If $k \geq k_+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$, then $\dim H^*(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = \dim H^*(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^{k_+}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$.*
- (iv) *If $k \geq k_+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$, then*

$$\chi(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = -\chi_1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^{k_+}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) ,$$

where for any Γ -module V with $\dim H^*(\Gamma, V) < \infty$ the first derived Euler characteristic $\chi_1(\Gamma, V)$ is defined by

$$\chi_1(\Gamma, V) := \sum_{p=1}^n (-1)^p p \dim H^p(\Gamma, V) .$$

(v) The order of the singularity of $Z_{S, \sigma, \varphi}$ at $\mu = \lambda$ is given by

$$\text{ord}_\lambda(Z_{S, \sigma, \varphi}) = \chi(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) .$$

For a further discussion of this conjecture we refer to the introduction of [19]. There the role of the Γ -module $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is played by the Γ -module $\mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))$. It will turn out that the module $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is much easier to deal with, but will have the same cohomology as $\mathcal{O}_\lambda C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\cdot, \varphi))$ shifted by degree one (at least in the cases, where the latter has been computed). The conjecture (in slightly different but equivalent formulation) has been proved in the following two cases:

- Γ cocompact, $\varphi = 1$ ([14]).
- $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, $\sigma = \varphi = 1$ ([19]).

The interested reader will find a discussion of these topics and related results and conjectures in the recent monograph [40].

In this section we will establish Assertions (i)-(iv) of Conjecture 8.1 for pairs (σ, λ) which are not very special (see Definition 4.7) and for all (σ, λ) in case $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$. This will be done by an explicit calculation of the cohomology groups in question in terms of the finite-dimensional spaces ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$, $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ and $H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$, where F is an irreducible finite-dimensional representation of G . These results give additional support to Assertion (v) of Conjecture 8.1 since the trace formula approach (if it succeeds) usually provides a description of the divisor of $Z_{S, \sigma, \varphi}$ in terms of scattering data like $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ and topological data like $H^p(\Gamma, F \otimes V_\varphi)$. Indeed, the results obtained here are a direct generalization of the corresponding results for $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, $\sigma = 1$, obtained in [19], which were comparable to the trace formula results of [58]. However, the trace formula for the general situation (see [22] for trivial φ) is up to now not in a sufficiently explicit shape in order to perform the analogous comparison, except for $\lambda \notin I_a \cup [-\delta_\Gamma, \delta_\Gamma]$, where we have

$$\text{ord}_\lambda(Z_{S, \sigma, 1}) = \dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda)) = \chi(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda)))$$

(see Remark 3 at the end of [22] and Theorem 8.9 below).

We will first investigate the cohomology of the modules $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ and $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. Therefore we have to look for suitable acyclic resolutions of these modules. This can be done for arbitrary discrete subgroups $\Gamma \subset G$. Recall that a Γ -module V is called acyclic, if $H^p(\Gamma, V) = \{0\}$ for all $p \geq 1$.

Let (γ, V_γ) be a finite-dimensional representation of K . By $V(\gamma) := G \times_K V_\gamma$ we denote the associated homogeneous vector bundle on $X = G/K$. We equip $V(\gamma, \varphi) := V(\gamma) \otimes V_\varphi$ with the tensor product Γ -action. The G -action on the first factor of $V(\gamma, \varphi)$ induces a Γ -equivariant action of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ on $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))$. In particular, for $\kappa \in \mathbb{C}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the kernel $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}$ of the operator $A_\kappa^k := (\Omega - \kappa)^k \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ becomes a Γ -module. Because of our rank one assumption $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ acts locally finitely on $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}$, and we obtain a finite direct sum decomposition

$$C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k} = \bigoplus_{\{\chi \mid \chi(\Omega) = \kappa\}} C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}^\chi \quad (97)$$

into $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules with generalized infinitesimal character. This decomposition respects the Γ -action. We also consider the Γ -modules

$$\begin{aligned} C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa)} &:= \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}, \\ C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))^\chi &= \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}^\chi. \end{aligned}$$

We form the bundle $V_Y(\gamma, \varphi) := \Gamma \backslash V(\gamma, \varphi)$ over $Y = \Gamma \backslash X$. Then we have the corresponding spaces of sections $C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))$, $C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}$ etc.

Lemma 8.2 *Let $\Gamma \subset G$ be a torsion-free discrete subgroup. Then*

1. *If Γ is not cocompact, then the Γ -modules $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}$ and $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}^\chi$ are acyclic.*
2. *If Γ is cocompact, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim H^0\left(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}\right) &= \dim H^1\left(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}\right) \\ &= \dim C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k} < \infty, \\ \dim H^0\left(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}^\chi\right) &= \dim H^1\left(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}^\chi\right) \\ &= \dim C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}^\chi < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$H^p\left(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}\right) = H^p\left(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}^\chi\right) = \{0\} \quad \text{for all } p \geq 2.$$

3. *If Γ is cocompact, then there exists a minimal number $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that*

$$H^0\left(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa)}\right) = C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa)} = C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^{k_0}}.$$

If, in addition, φ is unitary, then $k_0 \leq 1$.

4. *In any case, the modules $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa)}$ and $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))^\chi$ are acyclic.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{C}[A_\kappa]$ be the ring of all polynomials in A_κ . We consider functors Fin_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and Fin on the category of $\mathbb{C}[A_\kappa]$ -modules defined by

$$\text{Fin}_k(V) := \ker_V A_\kappa^k, \quad \text{Fin}(V) := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Fin}_k(V).$$

They are left exact. Let us denote their higher derived functors by Fin_k^q and Fin^q . Then (see [18], p. 52) $\text{Fin}_k^q = \text{Fin}^q = 0$ for all k and $q \geq 2$, and

$$\text{Fin}_k^1(V) := \text{coker}_V A_\kappa^k, \quad \text{Fin}^1(V) := \varinjlim_k \text{coker}_V A_\kappa^k, \quad (98)$$

where the limit has to be taken with respect to the map $A_\kappa : \text{coker}_V A_\kappa^k \rightarrow \text{coker}_V A_\kappa^{k+1}$.

Assume we are given a $(\mathbb{C}[\Gamma], \mathbb{C}[A_\kappa])$ -bimodule which is acyclic as a Γ -module and satisfies $\text{Fin}_1^1(V) = 0$. Then $\text{Fin}_k^1(V) = \text{Fin}(V) = 0$ for all k . It follows that

$$H^p(\Gamma, \text{Fin}_k(V)) = \text{Fin}_k^p(\Gamma V), \quad H^p(\Gamma, \text{Fin}(V)) = \text{Fin}^p(\Gamma V). \quad (99)$$

We want to apply (99) to the module $V = C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))$. In [14], Lemma 2.4., it was shown that $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))$ is Γ -acyclic. The argument given there also works with the additional twist V_φ . Hence $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))$ is acyclic. Moreover, the operator

$$A_\kappa : C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))$$

is surjective by Theorem 2.3. In other words, $\text{Fin}_1^1(C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))) = 0$. Now (99) and (98) yield

$$\begin{aligned} H^p(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}) &= H^p(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa^k)}) = \{0\} \quad \text{for all } p \geq 2, \\ H^1(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}) &= \text{coker} \left(A_\kappa^k : C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi)) \right), \\ H^1(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa)}) &= \varinjlim_k \text{coker} \left(A_\kappa^k : C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if Γ is not cocompact, then

$$H^1(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k}) = H^1(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa)}) = \{0\}$$

by Theorem 2.3.

We claim that for cocompact Γ there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa)} = C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^{k_0}}$$

is finite-dimensional and

$$C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi)) = C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^{k_0}} \oplus A_\kappa^{k_0} (C^\infty(Y, V_Y(\gamma, \varphi))) .$$

Indeed, if φ is unitary, then this assertion with $k_0 = 1$ is a consequence of the spectral theory of elliptic selfadjoint operators on a compact manifold. If φ fails to be unitary, we choose a Hermitian metric on $V_Y(\varphi)$ which gives rise to an L^2 scalar product on $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))$ and a corresponding Bochner-Laplace operator $\nabla^* \nabla$ on $L^2(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))$. It has the same principal symbol as $-A_\kappa$. Now we can argue as in the proof of Proposition 2.9.

The claim implies in particular that $H^1(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa)}) = \varinjlim_k \operatorname{coker} A_\kappa^k = 0$. Thus all assertions of the lemma concerning $H^p(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_\kappa^k})$ and $H^p(\Gamma, C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{(A_\kappa)})$ are now proved.

The assertions for the components with generalized infinitesimal character χ are now immediate consequences of the direct sum decomposition (97). $\square$

Let γ be a finite-dimensional representation of K , and let $T \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$. Then Formula (53) (with γ^p replaced by γ) defines a Poisson transform

$$P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow C^\infty(X, V(\gamma)) .$$

By G -equivariance it has values in $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$, where

$$A_{\sigma, \lambda} = \Omega - \chi_{\sigma, \lambda}(\Omega) .$$

Recall that $\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}(\Omega) = \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle - \|\rho_{\mathfrak{g}}\|^2 + \|\mu + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}}\|^2$.

We call an element $T \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ generating if the elements $v_T \in C^\omega(\partial X, V(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}))$, $v \in V_{\tilde{\gamma}}$, defined by $v_T(k) = T^*(\tilde{\gamma}(k^{-1})v)$, generate the G -module $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\tilde{\sigma}_{-\lambda}))$. It follows from the interpretation of the Poisson transform as a linear combination of matrix coefficients

$$\langle P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T f(g), v \rangle = c_{f, v_T}(g)$$

that $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T$ is injective if and only if T is generating. For any pair (σ, λ) one can always find a (not necessarily irreducible) γ such that $\operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ contains generating elements.

Proposition 8.3 *Assume that $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr, -}$. In case $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$ we require in addition that $\lambda \neq 0$. Then for any generating $T \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ the Poisson transform $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T$ identifies the G -module $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$ with a direct summand of $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$. Moreover, if $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$, then any non-zero $T \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ is generating.*

Proof. The proposition is a consequence of the theory of asymptotic expansions of matrix coefficients of Harish-Chandra modules (see e.g. [68], Chapter 4; [44], Chapter VIII; compare also [53]). We denote by $Y_{\sigma, \lambda}^k$ and Z the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda))$ and $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$, respectively. They are admissible and finitely generated (such modules are

usually called Harish-Chandra modules). Then $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda))$ and $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma,\lambda}}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}}$ constitute the maximal globalizations in the sense of Schmid [61], [42] of $Y_{\sigma,\lambda}^k$ and Z , respectively. By the main theorem of [61] or [42] it is therefore enough to prove that $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T$ identifies the $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module $Y_{\sigma,\lambda}$ with a direct summand of Z .

There is a countable set $E \subset \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ such that any $f \in Z$ has an asymptotic expansion for $a \rightarrow \infty$

$$f(a) \sim \sum_{\mu \in E} p_{\mu,f}(\log a) a^\mu, \quad (100)$$

where $p_{\mu,f}$ are polynomials on $\mathfrak{a}$ with values in V_γ . We call $\mu \in E$ a leading exponent of Z , if $p_{\mu+m\alpha,f} = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in Z$. Let $E^l \subset E$ be the set of leading exponents of Z . If $\sigma' \in \hat{M}$, $S \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\gamma, V_{\sigma'})$ and $\mu \in E^l$, then there is a well-defined MAN -equivariant map

$$\hat{\beta}_{\sigma',\mu+\rho}^S : Z/\mathfrak{n}Z \rightarrow V_{\sigma'_{\mu+\rho}} \otimes \Pi$$

given by $\hat{\beta}_{\sigma',\mu+\rho}^S([f]) := S \circ p_{\mu,f}$. Using that Z consists of eigensections of Ω it follows as in the proof of [14], Prop. 4.1, that for any leading exponent $\mu \neq -\rho$ of Z the polynomial $p_{\mu,f}$ is in fact a constant. In addition, if $-\rho$ is a leading exponent, then $\deg(p_{-\rho,f}) \leq 1$. By Casselman's Frobenius reciprocity ([68], 4.2.2) we obtain $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -equivariant maps

$$\beta_{\sigma',\nu}^S : Z \rightarrow Y_{\sigma',\nu}, \quad \nu - \rho \in E^l \setminus \{-\rho\}, \quad S \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\gamma, V_{\sigma'}).$$

If $-\rho \in E^l$, then we obtain maps $\tilde{\beta}_{\sigma',0}^S : Z \rightarrow Y_{\sigma',0}^2$. We then set

$$\beta_{\sigma',0}^S := \varrho \circ \tilde{\beta}_{\sigma',0}^S.$$

We call the maps $\beta_{\sigma',\nu}^S$ boundary value maps.

For $\text{Re}(\lambda) > 0$, $f \in Y_{\sigma,\lambda}$, we have the following limit formula (see [66] or [53], also [68], Thm. 5.3.4)

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a^{\rho-\lambda} P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T f(a) = c_\gamma(\lambda) T f(1). \quad (101)$$

For a discussion of the meromorphic function $c_\gamma : \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^* \rightarrow \text{End}_M(V_\gamma)$ and its relation to the Knapp-Stein intertwining operators we refer to [21], Section 5, in particular Lemma 5.5. It is regular for $\text{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$, $\lambda \neq 0$, and in this region it has the property that $c_\gamma(\lambda)T \neq 0$ for generating T .

If $\nu - \rho$ is a leading exponent of Z such that the map $\beta_{\sigma',\nu}^S$ is non-zero, then $Y_{\sigma',\nu}$ has infinitesimal character $\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}$. Thus, if $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr} \setminus I_\sigma^{wr,-}$, then $\lambda - \rho$ is a leading exponent of Z . Hence $\beta_{\sigma,\lambda}^S$ is defined on Z . Moreover, by Lemma 4.8, 3, we have $\lambda > 0$. Choose $S_0 \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\gamma, V_\sigma)$ such that $S_0 \circ c_\gamma(\lambda)T = \text{id}$. Then (101) implies that $\beta_{\sigma,\lambda}^{S_0} \circ P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T = \text{id}$. It follows that

$$Z = \text{im} P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T \oplus \ker \beta_{\sigma,\lambda}^{S_0}, \quad (102)$$

which proves the proposition for $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr} \setminus I_\sigma^{wr,-}$.

We now assume $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$, $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$. Choose $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ minimal such that $\lambda - \rho + m\alpha \in E^l$. We first assume that $m > 0$. By the above we obtain a bunch of boundary value maps

$$\beta_{\sigma', \lambda+m\alpha}^S : Z \rightarrow Y_{\sigma', \lambda+m\alpha}.$$

Let us denote the irreducible M -representations σ' which appear in such non-zero boundary value maps by $\sigma_1^m, \dots, \sigma_k^m$. The maps $\beta_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}^S$, $S \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\gamma, V_{\sigma_l^m})$, fit together to a map

$$\beta_{\lambda+m\alpha} = (\beta_{\sigma_1^m, \lambda+m\alpha}, \dots, \beta_{\sigma_k^m, \lambda+m\alpha}) : Z \rightarrow \bigoplus_{l=1}^k \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma_l^m}, V_\gamma) \otimes Y_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}$$

determined by the condition $(S \otimes \operatorname{id}) \circ \beta_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha} = \beta_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}^S$, $S \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\gamma, V_{\sigma_l^m})$. Here we have identified $\operatorname{End}_M(V_{\sigma_l^m})$ with $\mathbb{C}$ by Schur's Lemma. We also have a Poisson transform

$$P_{\lambda+m\alpha} : \bigoplus_{l=1}^k \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma_l^m}, V_\gamma) \otimes Y_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha} \rightarrow Z$$

given by $P_{\lambda+m\alpha}(T \otimes f) := P_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}^T f$, $T \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma_l^m}, V_\gamma)$, $f \in Y_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}$. Let $c_\gamma(\sigma, \lambda)$ denote the operator on $\operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ given by $c_\gamma(\sigma, \lambda)(T) := c_\gamma(\lambda) \circ T$. Now (101) implies that

$$\beta_{\lambda+m\alpha} \circ P_{\lambda+m\alpha} = (c_\gamma(\sigma_1, \lambda + m\alpha) \otimes \operatorname{id}, \dots, c_\gamma(\sigma_k, \lambda + m\alpha) \otimes \operatorname{id}).$$

Since the $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules $Y_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}$ have infinitesimal character $\chi_{\sigma_l, \lambda}$ they are irreducible by Lemma 4.6. This implies that $c_\gamma(\sigma_l^m, \lambda + m\alpha)$ is a non-zero multiple of the identity. Thus $\beta_{\lambda+m\alpha} \circ P_{\lambda+m\alpha}$ is bijective, and we obtain a direct sum decomposition

$$Z = \operatorname{im} P_{\lambda+m\alpha} \oplus \ker \beta_{\lambda+m\alpha}.$$

Set $Z_1 := \ker \beta_{\lambda+m\alpha}$. Then $\lambda - \rho + (m-1)\alpha$ is a leading exponent of Z_1 . Therefore we can define a boundary value $\beta_{\lambda+(m-1)\alpha}$ on Z_1 . Moreover, by (101) or a corresponding formula for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) = 0$ (see [21], Lemma 6.2) we have $\operatorname{im} P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T \subset Z_1$. Arguing inductively we find a direct sum decomposition

$$Z = W \oplus Z_m, \tag{103}$$

such that $\lambda - \rho$ is a leading exponent of Z_m and $\operatorname{im} P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T \subset Z_m$. Again using (101) or the analogous formulas for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) = 0$ we find as in the proof of (102) an element $S_0 \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\gamma, V_\sigma)$ such that

$$Z_m = \operatorname{im} P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T \oplus \ker \beta_{\sigma_\lambda}^{S_0}. \tag{104}$$

Note that this last argument does not work in the case $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$, $\lambda = 0$, since in this case $\deg p_{-\rho, P_{\sigma_0}^T} f = 0$, and hence $\beta_{\sigma_0}^S \circ P_{\sigma_0}^T = 0$ for any choice of S . Now for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$, $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$ the proposition follows from (103) and (104). That any non-zero $T \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ is generating is a consequence of the irreducibility of $Y_{\sigma, \lambda}$ (see Lemma 4.6 and [44], Cor. 14.30).

It remains to discuss the case $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) < 0$, $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$. The irreducibility of $Y_{\sigma, \lambda}$ and the functional equation of the Poisson transform ([21], Eq. (18)) now implies that $\operatorname{im} P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T = \operatorname{im} P_{\sigma_{-\lambda}}^{T^-}$,

where $T^- := \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \lambda} p_\sigma(\mu) \gamma(w) c_\gamma(\mu) T \sigma(w^{-1}) \in \text{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma^w}, V_\gamma)$. Moreover, $T^- \neq 0$ whenever $T \neq 0$. Note that $-\lambda \notin I_{\sigma^w}^{wr}$. We have therefore reduced the assertion to the case $\text{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$. This finishes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Let $q : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $q(h) = h(0)$, be the map taking the constant term. For $T \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ we set $T^+ := T \otimes q \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\sigma \otimes \Pi, V_\gamma)$. Let T^k be the restriction of T^+ to $V_\sigma \otimes \Pi^k$. As in Section 4 we obtain Poisson transforms

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^k} : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda)) &\rightarrow C^\infty(X, V(\gamma)) , \\ P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^+} : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda)) &\rightarrow C^\infty(X, V(\gamma)) . \end{aligned}$$

Using (47) one derives that

$$A_{\sigma, \lambda} \circ P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^+} = P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^+} \circ \varrho(2\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle + |\alpha|^2 \varrho) . \quad (105)$$

For $\lambda \neq 0$ this implies that $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^+}$ is injective whenever $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T$ is injective. Moreover, we see that $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^k}$ and $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^+}$ have values in $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}^k}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$ and $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$, respectively.

Proposition 8.4 *Assume that $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr, -} \cup \{0\}$. Then for any generating $T \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ the Poisson transforms $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^k}$ and $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^+}$ identify the G -modules $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda))$ and $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda))$ with a direct summand of $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}^k}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$ and $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$, respectively.*

Proof. We will follow the lines of the proof of Proposition 8.3. Again, it is sufficient to check the assertion for $\text{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$ on the level of the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules. Let Z^k be the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module of $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}^k}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$. Then any $f \in Z^k$ has an asymptotic expansion of the form (100), where the set of (leading) exponents of Z^k coincides with that of Z . For any leading exponent $\mu \neq -\rho$ we have $\deg p_{\mu, f} \leq k-1$. Thus we obtain boundary value maps

$$\beta_{\sigma', \nu}^S : Z^k \rightarrow Y_{\sigma', \nu}^k , \quad \nu - \rho \in E^l \setminus \{-\rho\}, \quad S \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\gamma, V_{\sigma'}) ,$$

and, if m is as in the proof of Proposition 8.3,

$$\beta_{\lambda+m\alpha} : Z^k \rightarrow \bigoplus_{l=1}^r \text{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma_l^m}, V_\gamma) \otimes Y_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}^k .$$

We define

$$P_{\lambda+m\alpha}^k : \bigoplus_{l=1}^r \text{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma_l^m}, V_\gamma) \otimes Y_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}^k \rightarrow Z^k$$

by $P_{\sigma_{l, \lambda+m\alpha}^m}^k (T \otimes f) := P_{\sigma_{l, \lambda+m\alpha}^m}^{T^k} f$. Since $\beta_{\lambda+m\alpha} \circ P_{\lambda+m\alpha}^k$ commutes with the action of the Casimir operator and with the projections on the direct summands it commutes with $\text{id} \otimes \varrho$

(here one uses $\lambda + m\alpha \neq 0$, compare (105)). Thus the bijectivity of $\beta_{\lambda+m\alpha} \circ P_{\lambda+m\alpha}$ on $\bigoplus_{l=1}^r \text{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma_l^m}, V_\gamma) \otimes Y_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}$ implies the bijectivity of $\beta_{\lambda+m\alpha} \circ P_{\lambda+m\alpha}^k$ on $\bigoplus_{l=1}^r \text{Hom}_M(V_{\sigma_l^m}, V_\gamma) \otimes Y_{\sigma_l^m, \lambda+m\alpha}^k$. It follows that

$$Z^k = \text{im} P_{\lambda+m\alpha}^k \oplus Z_1^k,$$

where $Z_1^k := \ker \beta_{\lambda+m\alpha}$. Inductively we find a decomposition

$$Z^k = W^k \oplus Z_m^k$$

such that $\lambda - \rho$ is a leading exponent of Z_m^k and $\text{im} P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^k} \subset Z_m^k$. Let S_0 be as in the proof of Proposition 8.3. Because of $\lambda \neq 0$ we see that $\beta_{\sigma, \lambda}^{S_0} \circ P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^k}$ is bijective, too. It follows that $Z^k = W^k \oplus \text{im} P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^k} \oplus \ker \beta_{\sigma, \lambda}^{S_0}$. $\square$

It remains to discuss the case $\lambda = 0$, $0 \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$. Recall that it is impossible that $0 \in I_\sigma^{wr} \setminus I_\sigma^{wr, -}$.

Proposition 8.5 *Assume that $0 \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$ and that $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$. Then for any generating $T \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ the Poisson transforms $P_{\sigma_0}^{T^k}$ and $P_{\sigma_0}^{T^+}$ are injective. Moreover, $P_{\sigma_0}^{T^{2k}}$ and $P_{\sigma_0}^{T^+}$ identify the G -modules $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^{2k}(\sigma_0))$ and $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))$ with a direct summand of $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma,0}^k}^{\chi_{\sigma,0}}$ and $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))^{\chi_{\sigma,0}}$, respectively.*

Proof. If $P_{\sigma_0}^{T^k}$ would have a nontrivial kernel then it would intersect $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_0))$ nontrivially by Assertion (ii) appearing in the proof of Proposition 4.23. This is impossible since T is generating. That $\text{im} P_{\sigma_0}^{T^{2k}} \subset C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}^k}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$ is a consequence of (105). In order to prove that $\text{im} P_{\sigma_0}^{T^{2k}}$ is a direct summand of $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}^k}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$ one proceeds as in the proof of Proposition 8.4. Arguing exactly as there we arrive at a decomposition

$$Z^k = W^k \oplus Z_m^k$$

such that $-\rho$ is a leading exponent of Z_m^k and $\text{im} P_{\sigma_0}^{T^{2k}} \subset Z_m^k$. For $f \in Z_m^k$ the polynomials $p_{-\rho, f}$ have degree at most $2k - 1$. For $S \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\gamma, V_\sigma)$ we obtain boundary value maps

$$\beta_{\sigma, 0}^S : Z_m^k \rightarrow Y_{\sigma, 0}^{2k}.$$

We now consider the limit formula ([21], Eq. (36))

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a^\rho P_{\sigma_0}^T f(a) = c_\gamma(0) T f(1) + T^w(\hat{J}_{\sigma, 0} f)(1), \quad (106)$$

where $T^w := \gamma(w) T \sigma(w^{-1})$.

If $\sigma \not\cong \sigma^w$, then $c_\gamma(0) T$ and T^w have values in the different M -isotypic components $V_\gamma(\sigma)$ and $V_\gamma(\sigma^w)$, respectively. If $\sigma \cong \sigma^w$, then Y splits into two eigenspaces of $\hat{J}_{\sigma, 0}$. Therefore the

relation between c_γ and $\hat{J}_{\sigma,0}$ (see e.g. [21], Lemma 5.5) yields a decomposition $T = T_+ + T_-$ such that $T^w = T_+^w + T_-^w$ and $c_\gamma(0)T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_\sigma(0)}}(T_+^w - T_-^w)$. Moreover, T is generating if and only if both components T_+ and T_- are non-zero. It follows that $\text{im } c_\gamma(0)T \cap \text{im } T^w = \{0\}$. Thus in any case we can find $S_0 \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\gamma, V_\sigma)$ such that $S_0 \circ c_\gamma(0)T = \text{id}$ and $S_0 \circ T^w = 0$. Then $\beta_{\sigma,0}^{S_0} \circ P_{\sigma_0}^T = \text{id}$. As at the beginning of the proof it follows that $\beta_{\sigma,0}^{S_0} \circ P_{\sigma_0}^{T^{2k}}$ is injective, and hence bijective. Therefore,

$$Z_m^k = \text{im } P_{\sigma_0}^{T^{2k}} \oplus \ker \beta_{\sigma,0}^{S_0},$$

which implies the proposition. $\square$

We now assume $p_\sigma(0) = 0$. In particular, $0 \notin I_\sigma^{wr}$ and $\sigma \cong \sigma^w$. Choose an irreducible representation γ of K such that $\dim \text{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma) = 1$. Such a representation always exists (see e.g. [44], Ch. XV). Then one can define a meromorphic function $c : \mathfrak{a}_\mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$c(\lambda)T := (c_\gamma(\lambda)T)^w, \quad T \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma).$$

The superscript w has the same meaning as in (106). As in [21], Sect. 5, we introduce a normalized intertwining operator

$$J_{\sigma,\lambda} := \frac{1}{c(-\lambda)} \hat{J}_{\sigma,\lambda}.$$

It satisfies the functional equation

$$J_{\sigma,-\lambda} \circ J_{\sigma,\lambda} = \text{id}. \quad (107)$$

Moreover, we have the functional equation of the Poisson transform (compare [21], (18))

$$P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T \circ J_{\sigma,-\lambda} = P_{\sigma_{-\lambda}}^T. \quad (108)$$

By Proposition 8.3 the Poisson transform $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^T$ is injective for $T \neq 0$. It follows that $J_{\sigma_0} = \text{id}$. The normalized intertwining operators induce an operator

$$J_+ : C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))$$

given by

$$J_+ ev(f_\mu) := -ev(J_{\sigma,-\mu} f_{-\mu}).$$

Here $f_\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0 C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_0))$. Because of (107) we have $J_+^2 = \text{id}$. We set

$$C_\pm^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0)) := \{f \in C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0)) \mid J_+ f = \pm f\}$$

and $C_\pm^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0)) := C_\pm^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0)) \cap C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0))$. Observe that $\varrho(C_\pm^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))) = C_\mp^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))$. We obtain the following decompositions of G - and $\mathbb{C}[\varrho^2]$ -modules

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0)) &= C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0)) \oplus C_-^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0)), \\ C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0)) &= C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0)) \oplus C_-^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

We have $C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^{2k}(\sigma_0)) = C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^{2k-1}(\sigma_0))$ and $C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_0)) = C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_0))$.

Proposition 8.6 *Assume that $p_\sigma(0) = 0$ and that $\dim \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma) = 1$. Then ϱ induces an isomorphism*

$$C_-^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0)) \cong C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0)) .$$

If $0 \neq T \in \operatorname{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$, then $\ker P_{\sigma_0}^{T+} = C_-^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))$. Moreover, $P_{\sigma_0}^{T^{2k-1}}$ and $P_{\sigma_0}^{T+}$ identify the G -modules $C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^{2k-1}(\sigma_0))$ and $C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))$ with a direct summand of $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma,0}^k}^{\chi_{\sigma,0}}$ and $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))^{\chi_{\sigma,0}}$, respectively.

Proof. The first assertion is obvious. As in (62) we obtain for $f \in \mathcal{M}_0 C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma))$

$$P_{\sigma_0}^{T+} \circ \operatorname{ev}(f_\mu) = \operatorname{res}_{z=0} P_{\sigma, z\alpha}^T f_{z\alpha} .$$

Assume now that $\operatorname{ev}(f_\mu) \in C_-^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))$. Then $J_{\sigma, -z\alpha} f_{-z\alpha} = f_{z\alpha} \bmod \mathcal{O}_0 C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma))$. Equation (108) implies that

$$P_{\sigma, z\alpha}^T f_{z\alpha} = P_{\sigma, -z\alpha}^T f_{-z\alpha} \bmod \mathcal{O}_0 C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma)) .$$

It follows that $P_{\sigma_0}^{T+} \circ \operatorname{ev}(f_\mu) = 0$, hence $\ker P_{\sigma_0}^{T+} \supset C_-^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))$.

By (105) any nontrivial G -submodule of $C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))$ has nontrivial intersection with $C_-^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_0))$. We know from Proposition 8.3 that $\ker P_{\sigma_0}^{T+} \cap C_-^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^1(\sigma_0)) = \{0\}$. It follows that $\ker P_{\sigma_0}^{T+} = C_-^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_0))$.

In order to show that $P_{\sigma_0}^{T^{2k-1}}(C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^{2k-1}(\sigma_0)))$ is a direct summand of $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma))_{A_{\sigma,0}^k}^{\chi_{\sigma,0}}$ one proceeds as in the proof of Proposition 8.5. Instead of the boundary value map

$$\beta_{\sigma,0}^S : Z_m^k \rightarrow Y_{\sigma,0}^{2k}$$

one uses the map

$$p_+ \circ \varrho \circ \beta_{\sigma,0}^S : Z_m^k \rightarrow Y_{\sigma,+}^{2k-1} ,$$

where $Y_{\sigma,+}^{2k-1}$ is the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module of $C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^{2k-1}(\sigma_0))$ and $p_+ : Y_{\sigma,0}^{2k-1} \rightarrow Y_{\sigma,+}^{2k-1}$ is the projection corresponding to (109). $\square$

We now combine the previous four propositions with Lemma 8.2.

Proposition 8.7 *Let $\Gamma \subset G$ be a torsion-free discrete subgroup, and let (φ, V_φ) be a finite-dimensional representation of Γ . Assume that (σ, λ) is not very special, i.e., $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr,-}$. Then*

1. *The Γ -module $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is acyclic.*
2. *If Γ is not cocompact, then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the Γ -module $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is acyclic.*

3. Let Γ be cocompact. Then there exists a minimal number $k_+ = k_+(\sigma, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^{k_+}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) .$$

The spaces $H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$ and $H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$ are finite-dimensional. If, in addition, φ is unitary, then $k_+(\sigma, \lambda) \leq 1$ except for $p_\sigma(0) = 0$, $\lambda = 0$, in which case $k_+(\sigma, 0) \in \{0, 2\}$.

4. If Γ is cocompact, then

$$\begin{aligned} \dim H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) &= \dim H^1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) < \infty , \\ H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) &= \{0\} \quad \text{for all } p \geq 2 . \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

In particular, $\chi(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = 0$.

5. If Γ is cocompact, then for any $k \geq k_+(\sigma, \lambda)$

$$\chi(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = -\chi_1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = \dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) .$$

Assertion 3 also holds without the assumption $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr, -}$.

Proof. For any pair (σ, λ) and a generating $T \in \text{Hom}_M(V_\sigma, V_\gamma)$ the Poisson transform $P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^k} := P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^k} \otimes \text{id}_{V_\varphi}$ injects $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ ($C_+^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_0, \varphi))$, if $\lambda = 0$ and $p_\sigma(0) = 0$) into $C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}^k}$. Thus the first statement of Assertion 3 is a consequence of Lemma 8.2,

3. Moreover, for $\lambda \neq 0$ we have $\text{im } P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^{k+r}} \cap C^\infty(X, V(\gamma, \varphi))_{A_{\sigma, \lambda}^k} = \text{im } P_{\sigma_\lambda}^{T^k}$. It follows, that $k_+(\sigma, \lambda) \leq 1$ for unitary φ and $\lambda \neq 0$. That this also holds for $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$, $\lambda = 0$, can be proved as in Proposition 4.23. The case $p_\sigma(0) = 0$, $\lambda = 0$ is covered by Proposition 8.6.

Assertions 1, 2, and Equation (110) are immediate consequences of Lemma 8.2, and Propositions 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, and 8.6, respectively.

The long exact cohomology sequence associated to

$$0 \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{\varrho^k} C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow 0$$

degenerates to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) &\rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{\varrho_\Gamma^k} {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \\ &\rightarrow H^1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \rightarrow 0 . \end{aligned}$$

Since for cocompact Γ the space ${}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is finite-dimensional the equality

$$\dim H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = \dim H^1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$$

as well as the remaining assertions of the proposition follow. For Assertion 5 we have also used Theorem 3.3. $\square$

We now consider the decomposition $\partial X = \Lambda \cup \Omega$. Since the sheaf of hyperfunction sections of a vector bundle is flabby we obtain the following exact sequences of Γ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{res_\Omega} C^{-\omega}(\Omega, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow 0, \quad (111)$$

$$0 \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{res_\Omega} C^{-\omega}(\Omega, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow 0. \quad (112)$$

Lemma 8.8 *The Γ -modules $C^{-\omega}(\Omega, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ and $C^{-\omega}(\Omega, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ are acyclic.*

Proof. Since the action of Γ on Ω is properly discontinuous and $C^{-\omega}(\Omega, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$, $C^{-\omega}(\Omega, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ are the spaces of global sections of a flabby Γ -equivariant sheaves on Ω the lemma can be shown in the same way as [14], Lemma 2.6. $\square$

Theorem 8.9 *Let $\Gamma \subset G$ be a torsion-free convex cocompact discrete subgroup of G , and let (φ, V_φ) be a finite-dimensional representation of G . Assume that (σ, λ) is not very special, i.e., $\lambda \notin I_\sigma^{wr, -}$. Then Assertions (i)-(iv) of Conjecture 8.1 hold true. In addition, we have*

1. *The Γ -module $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ is acyclic.*

2. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) &= \dim H^1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \\ &= \dim E_\Lambda^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi), \quad \text{if } \Gamma \text{ is not cocompact,} \\ H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) &= \{0\} \quad \text{for all } p \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

3. *For any $k \geq k_+(\sigma, \lambda)$*

$$\chi(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = -\chi_1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = \dim^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)).$$

Proof. The case of cocompact Γ is already covered by Proposition 8.7. We thus assume $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. By Proposition 8.7 and Lemma 8.8 the sequence (112) provides an acyclic resolution of $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. We thus have to determine the cohomology of the complex

$$0 \rightarrow {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{res} C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow 0.$$

The surjectivity of ϱ_B combined with (34) implies the surjectivity of

$$res : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)).$$

It follows that all higher cohomology groups of $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ vanish. By Proposition 4.16 we have the following equality of finite-dimensional spaces

$$\dim H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = E_\Lambda^{k+}(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) .$$

The long exact cohomology sequence associated to

$$0 \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{\varrho^k} C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow 0$$

now reads as

$$0 \rightarrow E_\Lambda^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \rightarrow E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \xrightarrow{\varrho_\Gamma^k} E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \rightarrow H^1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \rightarrow 0 .$$

From this it is easy to derive the remaining assertions of the theorem. $\square$

Theorem 8.9 says that interesting phenomena, i.e., higher cohomology groups of $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$, occur for $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr,-}$, only. In the rest of this section we will determine these cohomology groups in case $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$. This is based on the results of Sections 5 and 6.

From now on let G be one of the groups $Spin(1, n)$ or $SO(1, n)_0$. Recall that in this case $I_\sigma^{wr} = I_\sigma^r$. We have seen in Section 6 that for $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$ there exist an irreducible G -representation (π, F) having infinitesimal character $\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}$ and an element $p \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\} \cup \{+, -\}$ such that $\sigma_\lambda = \sigma_{F, \lambda_p}^p$. Then we set

$$(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}, F_{\sigma_\lambda}) := (\pi, F) , \quad l_{\sigma_\lambda} = n - p \quad \text{for } p \neq \pm \quad \text{and} \quad l_{\sigma_\lambda} := \frac{n+1}{2} \quad \text{if } p = \pm .$$

Using the formulas in Section 6 this definition can be made more explicit. Let $\lambda = r\alpha$, and let σ have highest weight $\mu_\sigma = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{[\frac{n-1}{2}]})$. Let i be the smallest number such that $|r| > m_i + \frac{n-1}{2} - i$. Then

$$l_{\sigma_\lambda} = \begin{cases} n+1-i & \lambda \geq 0 \\ i & \lambda \leq 0 \end{cases} .$$

Moreover, if n is even, then F_{σ_λ} has highest weight

$$(m_1 - 1, \dots, m_{i-1} - 1, |r| + i - \frac{n+1}{2}, m_i, \dots, m_{\frac{n-2}{2}}) .$$

For odd n this highest weight is given by

$$(m_1 - 1, \dots, m_{i-1} - 1, |r| + i - \frac{n+1}{2}, m_i, \dots, m_{\frac{n-3}{2}}, \text{sign}(r)m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}) , \quad i \leq \frac{n-1}{2} ,$$

$$(m_1 - 1, \dots, m_{\frac{n-3}{2}} - 1, |m_{\frac{n-1}{2}}| - 1, \text{sign}(m_{\frac{n-1}{2}})r) , \quad i = \frac{n+1}{2} .$$

By $\tilde{Z}_{F_{\sigma_\lambda}}^p$ we denote the spaces of cocycles of (77) for trivial Γ and φ . If $l_{\sigma_\lambda} \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$, then $\tilde{Z}_{F_{\sigma_\lambda}}^{n-l_{\sigma_\lambda}}$ is a G -submodule of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$, whereas for $l_{\sigma_\lambda} = \frac{n+1}{2}$ we have $\tilde{Z}_{F_{\sigma_\lambda}}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \cong C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$. We let G act on both factors the flat vector bundle $\tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}) := X \times F_{\sigma_\lambda}$ over X . This G -action induces a $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -action on $\Omega^*(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda})) \cong \Omega^*(X) \otimes F_{\sigma_\lambda}$.

Proposition 8.10 *If $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$, then the following sequences are exact:*

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda)) \rightarrow \Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \xrightarrow{d} \Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \\
&\quad \xrightarrow{d} \dots \xrightarrow{d} \Omega^n(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \rightarrow 0, \\
0 &\rightarrow \tilde{Z}_{F_{\sigma_\lambda}}^{n-l_{\sigma_\lambda}} \rightarrow \Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d \\ d* \end{pmatrix}} \begin{array}{c} \Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \\ \oplus \\ \Omega^{n+1-l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}} \\
&\quad \dots \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}} \begin{array}{c} \Omega^n(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \\ \oplus \\ \Omega^{2n-2l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & d \end{pmatrix}} \Omega^{2n-2l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \xrightarrow{d} \\
&\quad \dots \xrightarrow{d} \Omega^n(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proposition is a consequence of Proposition 6.1, Proposition 5.3, and the surjectivity of $\hat{\Delta} : \Omega^p(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda})) \rightarrow \Omega^p(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))$. In fact, the exactness of the pieces of the de Rham complexes $\Omega^*(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}}$ appearing in these complexes is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.7 and the fact that $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ acts locally finitely on $\Omega^*(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}$. It remains to show that for a pair of closed forms $(\omega, \eta) \in \Omega^{p+1}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \oplus \Omega^{n-p+1}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}}$ there exist $\psi \in \Omega^p(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}}$ such that $d\psi = \omega$, $d* \psi = \eta$. Since $H^k(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda})) = \{0\}$ for $k > 0$ we find $\psi_0, \psi_1 \in \Omega^p(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}}$ such that $d\psi_0 = \omega$, $d* \psi_1 = \eta$. Now by Corollary 2.6 the equation $\hat{\Delta}\psi_2 = *(\psi_1 - \psi_0)$ is solvable in $\Omega^{n-p}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}}$. We set $\psi := \psi_0 + (-1)^{(p-1)(n-1)+1} d* \psi_2$. Then $d\psi = \omega$ and $d* \psi = d* \psi_0 + d\hat{\Delta}\psi_2 = d* \psi_1 = \eta$. $\square$

Proposition 8.11 *Let $\Gamma \subset G$ be a torsion-free discrete subgroup of G , and let (φ, V_φ) be a finite-dimensional representation of Γ . Let $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$. Then we have for all $p \geq 1$*

$$H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \cong H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+p}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi). \quad (113)$$

If Γ is not cocompact or φ is unitary, then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \geq 1$ there is a natural isomorphism

$$H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \cong H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+p}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) \oplus H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+p-1}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi). \quad (114)$$

For cocompact Γ and general φ the isomorphism (114) holds for all $p \geq 2$, while for $p = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim H^1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) &= \dim H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) \\
&\quad + \dim H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))).
\end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

Proof. By Lemma 8.2 the Γ -module $\Omega^p(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}$ is acyclic. Since $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ acts locally finitely on this module $\Omega^p(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$ is a direct summand of it, hence is acyclic, too. Now Proposition 8.10 provides an acyclic resolution of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) &\rightarrow \Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}} \xrightarrow{d} \Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}} \\ &\xrightarrow{d} \dots \xrightarrow{d} \Omega^n(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

It follows that $H^*(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$ is given as the cohomology of the complex

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow \Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(Y, E(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}} &\xrightarrow{d} \Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}(Y, E(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}} \xrightarrow{d} \\ &\dots \xrightarrow{d} \Omega^n(Y, E(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

(113) now follows from Theorem 2.7 combined with the observation that taking the component having the correct infinitesimal character does not change the cohomology (compare the proof of Theorem 6.3).

We now look at the long exact sequence associated to

$$0 \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{i} C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{\varrho^k} C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow 0.$$

We need the following

Lemma 8.12 *Let ϱ_p be the operator induced by ϱ on $H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$. Then $\varrho_p = 0$ for all $p \geq 1$.*

Proof. We look at the operator $|\alpha|^2 \varrho((n+1-2l_{\sigma_\lambda})\text{id} - \varrho)$. By (64) the Laplacians $\hat{\Delta}$ on $\Omega^k(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$, $k \geq l_{\sigma_\lambda}$ extend it to the acyclic resolution (116) of $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. However, the Laplacians act by zero on the higher cohomology groups of (117). It follows that $|\alpha|^2 \varrho_p((n+1-2l_{\sigma_\lambda})\text{id} - \varrho)_p = 0$ for $p \geq 1$. Since for $l_{\sigma_\lambda} \neq \frac{n+1}{2}$ the operator $(n+1-2l_{\sigma_\lambda})\text{id} - \varrho$ is invertible $((n+1-2l_{\sigma_\lambda})\text{id} - \varrho)_p$ is invertible, too. Hence $\varrho_p = 0$. For $l_{\sigma_\lambda} = \frac{n+1}{2}$ we extend ϱ by a constant multiple of d^* on $\Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$ (see (66)) and by the zero operator on $\Omega^k(X, \tilde{E}(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\hat{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}}$ for $k > l_{\sigma_\lambda}$. Again $\varrho_p = 0$ follows. $\square$

We continue the proof of Proposition 8.11. By Lemma 8.12 the above mentioned long exact sequence gives rise to short exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\rightarrow \text{coker } \varrho_0^k \rightarrow H^1\left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))\right) \xrightarrow{i_1} H^1\left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))\right) \rightarrow 0, \\ 0 &\rightarrow H^{p-1}\left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))\right) \rightarrow H^p\left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))\right) \\ &\xrightarrow{i_p} H^p\left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad p \geq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

By Proposition 8.7, 3, the space $H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$ is finite-dimensional for cocompact Γ . It follows that $\dim \operatorname{coker} \varrho_0^k = \dim \ker \varrho_0^k = \dim H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$. This implies (115).

It remains to construct a split of i_p in the sequences (118) except for $p = 1$, Γ cocompact, φ not unitary. The second complex in Proposition 8.10 gives rise to an acyclic resolution of $\tilde{Z}_{F_{\sigma_\lambda}}^{n-l_{\sigma_\lambda}} \otimes V_\varphi$. Sending a cocycle $\omega \in Z^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+p}(Y, E(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes \varphi))_{(\tilde{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}}$ of (117) to $(\omega, 0) \in \Omega^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+p}(Y, E(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\tilde{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}} \oplus \Omega^{n-l_{\sigma_\lambda}+p}(Y, E(\pi_{\sigma_\lambda}))_{(\tilde{\Delta})}^{\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}}$ defines for $p \geq 2$ a map

$$q_p : H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \rightarrow H^p(\Gamma, \tilde{Z}_{F_{\sigma_\lambda}}^{n-l_{\sigma_\lambda}} \otimes V_\varphi) . \quad (119)$$

Using Hodge theoretic arguments as for example in the proof of Proposition 8.10 we see that q_p is also well-defined for $p = 1$ unless Γ is cocompact and φ not unitary. Let $j : \tilde{Z}_{F_{\sigma_\lambda}}^{n-l_{\sigma_\lambda}} \otimes V_\varphi \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ be the inclusion. Then by construction $(i \circ j)_p \circ q_p = \operatorname{id}$. Thus $j_p \circ q_p$ provides the desired splitting. $\square$

Using the second sequence in Proposition 8.10 one can also compute the higher cohomology groups of $\tilde{Z}_{F_{\sigma_\lambda}}^{n-l_{\sigma_\lambda}} \otimes V_\varphi$. We find for $p \geq 1$ ($p \geq 2$ if Γ is cocompact and φ not unitary) that

$$H^p(\Gamma, \tilde{Z}_{F_{\sigma_\lambda}}^{n-l_{\sigma_\lambda}} \otimes V_\varphi) \cong H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+p}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) \oplus H^{n-l_{\sigma_\lambda}+p}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) .$$

Now we assume Γ to be convex cocompact. In order to get a uniform description of the cohomology for all cases including cocompact Γ we let $\tilde{E}_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ be the kernel of the surjection $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi)$ appearing in Theorem 6.3. Then for noncocompact Γ we have $\tilde{E}_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$, whereas $\tilde{E}_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = \{0\}$, if Γ is cocompact and φ is unitary.

Theorem 8.13 *Let $\Gamma \subset G$ be a torsion-free convex cocompact discrete subgroup of Γ , and let $\lambda \in I_\sigma^*$. Then Assertions (i)-(iv) of Conjecture 8.1 hold true. More precisely, we have*

1. For all $p \geq 1$

$$H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \cong H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+p}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) ,$$

and there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \tilde{E}_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) \rightarrow H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \rightarrow H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) \rightarrow 0 .$$

For $k \geq k_+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ we have

$$H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) .$$

2. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} H^p \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) &\cong H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda} + p}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) \\ &\quad \oplus H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda} + p - 1}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) , \quad p \geq 2 , \\ \dim H^1 \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) &= \dim H^0 \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) \\ &\quad + \dim H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda} + 1}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) . \end{aligned}$$

3. For any $k \geq k_+(\sigma, \lambda)$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) &= -\chi_1 \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) \\ &= \dim {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) + \sum_{p=l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}^n (-1)^{p-l_{\sigma_\lambda}} \dim H^p(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) \\ &= \dim \tilde{E}_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) + \sum_{p=l_{\sigma_\lambda}}^n (-1)^{p-l_{\sigma_\lambda}} \dim H^p(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) . \end{aligned}$$

For $l_{\sigma_\lambda} = 1$ this sum can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \chi \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) &= \dim \tilde{E}_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) + \dim {}^\Gamma (F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) - \chi(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) \\ &= \dim \tilde{E}_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) + \dim {}^\Gamma (F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) - \dim(F_{\sigma_\lambda}) \dim(V_\varphi) \chi(Y) . \end{aligned}$$

Here $\chi(Y)$ is the topological Euler characteristic of Y .

Proof. It is sufficient to prove Assertions 1 and 2 and that $\chi \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) = 0$. All facts claimed concerning $H^0 \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right)$ and $H^0 \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right)$ are already known from Theorem 6.3. For cocompact Γ the theorem now follows immediately from Proposition 8.11. We thus assume Γ to be noncocompact.

The long exact sequence associated to (112) together with Lemma 8.8 and the surjectivity of

$$res : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

(compare the proof of Theorem 8.9) provides isomorphisms of $\mathbb{C}[\varrho]$ -modules

$$H^p \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) \cong H^p \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) , \quad p \geq 1 . \quad (120)$$

Now Assertion 1 follows from Proposition 8.11. In particular, all cohomology groups of $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ are finite-dimensional. Let ϱ_Λ be the restriction of ϱ to $C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$. Now the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{i} C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \xrightarrow{\varrho_\Lambda^k} C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow 0 \quad (121)$$

implies that $H^p \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right)$ is finite-dimensional and that

$$\chi \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) = \chi \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) - \chi \left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \right) = 0 .$$

ϱ_Λ induces an operator $\varrho_{\Lambda,0}$ on $H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$. We look at the long exact sequence associated to (121). Because of (120) and Lemma 8.12 we obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \operatorname{coker}(\varrho_{\Lambda,0})^k \rightarrow H^1\left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))\right) \xrightarrow{i_1} H^1\left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

The space $H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$ is finite-dimensional. It follows that $\dim \operatorname{coker}(\varrho_{\Lambda,0})^k = \dim \ker(\varrho_{\Lambda,0})^k = \dim H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$. Moreover,

$$H^1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \cong H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi)$$

by Assertion 1. It follows that

$$\dim H^1\left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))\right) = \dim H^0\left(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))\right) + \dim H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi).$$

The direct sum decomposition of $H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$ claimed in Assertion 2 follows from the long exact sequence associated to (111), Lemma 8.8 and Proposition 8.11. The proof of the theorem is now complete. $\square$

We conclude this section by a couple of remarks on Theorem 8.13.

For any σ there exists a constant $c(\sigma) \geq 0$ such that for $\lambda \in I_\sigma^r$ with $|\lambda| > c_\sigma$ we have

$$l_{\sigma_\lambda} = \begin{cases} n & \lambda > 0 \\ 1 & \lambda < 0 \end{cases}.$$

Assume φ to be unitary. For $l_{\sigma_\lambda} = n$ the vanishing results Corollary 4.13 and Proposition 7.3 imply that $H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = \{0\}$ for all p with the obvious exception $\sigma = 1$ and Γ cocompact. Thus the generic non-zero contribution to the expected "topological part" of the divisor of the Selberg zeta function

$$\{(\lambda, \chi(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))) \mid \lambda \in I_\sigma^r\}$$

is given by

$$\{(\lambda, \dim E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) + \dim {}^\Gamma(F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) - \dim(F_{\sigma_\lambda}) \dim(V_\varphi) \chi(Y)) \mid \lambda < -c_\sigma\}.$$

For cocompact Γ and $\sigma_\lambda \neq 1_{-\rho}$ we have $E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) = \{0\}$, ${}^\Gamma(F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) = \{0\}$. Thus the above multiplicity simplifies to $-\dim(F_{\sigma_\lambda}) \dim(V_\varphi) \chi(Y)$. This coincides with the formula for the order of the singularity of $Z_{S,\sigma,\varphi}$ at very negative integer points obtained in [15], Thm. 3.15.

If σ is trivial, then we can choose $c(\sigma) = 0$. If in addition, Γ is not cocompact and φ is trivial, then $\dim E_\Lambda^+(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi) + \dim {}^\Gamma(F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi)$ can be identified with the multiplicity n_λ of the pole of a normalized version of the scattering matrix $\hat{S}_\mu$ at $\mu = \lambda$ (see [19], Section 5). We obtain for negative $\lambda \in I_1^r$

$$\chi(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^+(1_\lambda))) = n_\lambda - \chi(Y) \dim F_{1_\lambda}.$$

It was proved by Patterson and Perry [58] that the right hand side coincides with $\text{ord}_\lambda(Z_{S,1,1})$. This eventually led to the proof of Conjecture 8.1, (v), in this special case [19]. One of the difficulties one is confronted with, if one tries to extend this approach to general σ , is that for $l_{\sigma_\lambda} \notin \{1, n\}$ the normalized scattering matrix has an infinite-dimensional pole at λ , and thus there is no easy definition of the multiplicity n_λ .

One can also get more precise information on the spaces $H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)))$, $p = 0, 1$. Assume Γ to be noncocompact. Let

$$\text{res}_k : {}^\Gamma C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)) \rightarrow C^{-\omega}(B, V_B^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$$

be the restriction map. The long exact sequence associated to (111) combined with (114) yields an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{coker res}_k \rightarrow H^1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) \rightarrow H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}+1}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) \oplus H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi) \rightarrow 0.$$

Combining this with Assertion 2 of Theorem 8.13 we obtain an alternative proof of Corollary 6.8:

$$\dim H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V^k(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))) = \dim \text{coker res}_k + \dim H^{l_{\sigma_\lambda}}(\Gamma, F_{\sigma_\lambda} \otimes V_\varphi).$$

For $n = 2$ and noncocompact Γ the dimensions of the cohomology groups $H^p(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(1_\lambda)))$ have been computed in [17] by slightly different methods. Note that in this case Γ has cohomological dimension 1. Thus

$$\dim H^0(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(1_\lambda))) = \dim H^1(\Gamma, C^{-\omega}(\Lambda, V(1_\lambda))) .$$

We refer to the end of Section 6 for a discussion of the dimension of H^0 at negative half integers λ .

9 The discrete spectrum and L^2 -cohomology of Kleinian manifolds

In this section we consider a torsion-free convex cocompact non-cocompact subgroup of a linear rank one Lie group G . Let $K \subset G$ be a maximal compact subgroup, and let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ be the corresponding Cartan decomposition of the Lie algebra. We freely use all the notation introduced in previous sections. Whenever spaces of the form $E_\Lambda^1(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ occur we tacitly assume that $X = G/K \neq \mathbb{O}H^2$ or that $\delta_\Gamma < 0$. Let (φ, V_φ) be a finite-dimensional unitary representation of Γ . G acts unitarily on the Hilbert space

$$L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) := \{f : G \rightarrow V_\varphi \mid f(gx) = \varphi(g)f(x) \ \forall g \in \Gamma, x \in G, \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} |f(x)|^2 dx < \infty\},$$

where the action is given by right translation. One of the main results of [21] was the decomposition of this representation into irreducible ones, the so called Plancherel Theorem. Based on the results of Section 4 we will give a more precise description of the irreducible representations which can occur discretely in this decomposition.

The second theme will be L^2 -cohomology of Kleinian manifolds. Let (π, F) be an irreducible finite-dimensional representation of G . The admissible scalar product on F (see Subsection 7.3) induces an L^2 scalar product on the space $\Omega_c^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ of compactly supported differential forms with values in the flat vector bundle $E(\pi \otimes \varphi)$ such that the corresponding Hilbert space of square-integrable forms satisfies

$$\Omega_{(2)}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \cong [L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^* \mathfrak{p}^*]^K. \quad (122)$$

Using results on $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -cohomology we will compute the L^2 -cohomology groups $H_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ and their reduced versions $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ in terms of multiplicities of the unitary representations with infinitesimal character $\chi_{\tilde{F}}$ in the discrete part of $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$, i.e., in terms of invariant distributions supported on the limit set. Here $\tilde{F}$ is the dual representation of F . A comparison of these results with Theorem 6.3 then shows that for $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ and $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$ the natural map

$$\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$$

is an isomorphism. This generalizes the main result of [50] for convex cocompact Γ to non-trivial π and φ .

In order to state our refined version of the Plancherel Theorem for $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$ we will introduce a couple of $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules. By $H^{\sigma, \lambda}$ we denote the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module of $C^\infty(\partial X, V(\sigma_\lambda))$. Recall that for $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > 0$ it has the unique nontrivial irreducible submodule $I^{\sigma, \lambda}$.

Let $\sigma \in \hat{M}$ such that $p_\sigma(0) = 0$. Let $0 < \lambda_\sigma \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ be the corresponding end of the complementary series, i.e., the interval $(0, \lambda_\sigma)$ consists of all λ with $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > 0$ such that $H^{\sigma, \lambda}$ is irreducible and unitarizable. λ_σ can be characterized as the smallest $\lambda > 0$ such that $H^{\sigma, \lambda}$

becomes reducible. In particular, $\lambda_\sigma \in I_\sigma^{wr}$ (see Lemma 4.6). The value of λ_σ is explicitly known in all cases (see [3] and the literature cited therein). For $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ it is given before Proposition 4.24. Note that $\lambda_{\tilde{\sigma}} = \lambda_\sigma$. We set

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{res}}(\varphi) := \bigoplus_{\{\sigma \in \hat{M} \mid p_\sigma(0)=0\}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in (0, \lambda_\sigma) \cap (0, \delta_\Gamma]} E_\Lambda^1(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi) \otimes H^{\sigma, \lambda}.$$

For any σ the sum over λ is actually finite by Corollary 4.13. By (38) and Lemma 4.9 we have $E_\Lambda^1(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi) = {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi))$ unless $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr, -}$. By the remark following Lemma 4.6 this cannot happen for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_\sigma)$ and $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ or $X = \mathbb{C}H^n$. We have seen in the proof of Proposition 4.21 that the matrix coefficient map

$$E_\Lambda^1(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi) \otimes H^{\sigma, \lambda} \ni f \otimes \phi \mapsto c_{f, \phi}$$

injects $E_\Lambda^1(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi) \otimes H^{\sigma, \lambda}$ in a $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -equivariant way into $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_K$, where $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_K$ denotes the $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module of K -finite smooth vectors in $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$. We obtain an embedding of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{res}}(\varphi)$ into $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_K$. Let $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{\text{res}}$ be the closure in $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$ of the image of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{res}}(\varphi)$ under the matrix coefficient map.

We further introduce

$$\mathcal{H}_{U,+}(\varphi) := \bigoplus_{\{\sigma \in \hat{M} \setminus \{1\} \mid p_\sigma(0)=0\}} \bigoplus_{\{\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr, -} \cap (0, \delta_\Gamma] \mid I^{\sigma, \lambda} \text{unitarizable}\}} U_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi) \otimes I^{\sigma, \lambda}.$$

Again by the remark following Lemma 4.6 we have in case $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ or $X = \mathbb{C}H^n$ that $U_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi) = {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi))$ for $\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr, -}$. Moreover, it is known that in these two cases

$$\{\lambda \in \mathfrak{a}^* \mid \text{Re}(\lambda) > 0, I^{\sigma, \lambda} \text{unitarizable}\} = (0, \lambda_\sigma]. \quad (123)$$

It follows that

$$\{\lambda \in I_\sigma^{wr, -} \cap (0, \delta_\Gamma] \mid I^{\sigma, \lambda} \text{unitarizable}\} \subset \{\lambda_\sigma\}.$$

Last but not least we collect the contributions of the principal series modules $H^{\sigma, 0}$ for $p_\sigma(0) \neq 0$. For $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, n odd, let $\hat{M}_0 \subset \hat{M}$ a set of representatives of $W(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a})$ -orbits of representations which factorize over $SO(n-1)$ and which are not Weyl-invariant. We set

$$\mathcal{H}_{U,0}(\varphi) := \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \hat{M}_0} U_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \varphi) \otimes H^{\sigma, 0}.$$

If $\dim X$ is even, then $\hat{M}_0 := \{\sigma \in \hat{M} \mid 0 \in I_\sigma^{wr}\}$. Note that for $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, n even, $\hat{M}_0 = \emptyset$. The module $H^{\sigma, 0}$ splits into two eigenspaces of $\hat{J}_{\sigma, 0}$

$$H^{\sigma, 0} = H^{\sigma, +} \oplus H^{\sigma, -}.$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$U_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \varphi) = U_\Lambda^+(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \varphi) \oplus U_\Lambda^-(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \varphi).$$

Then

$$\mathcal{H}_{U,0}(\varphi) := \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \hat{M}_0} U_\Lambda^+(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \varphi) \otimes H^{\sigma, +} \oplus U_\Lambda^-(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \varphi) \otimes H^{\sigma, -}.$$

We set

$$\mathcal{H}_U(\varphi) := \mathcal{H}_{U,+}(\varphi) \oplus \mathcal{H}_{U,0}(\varphi)$$

Let $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_U$ be the closure in $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$ of the image of $\mathcal{H}_U(\varphi)$ under the matrix coefficient map.

Recall the definition and classification of discrete series representations of G from e.g. [44], Chapters IX and XII. We can now formulate the following refinement of [21], Theorem 11.1.

Theorem 9.1 *If $X \neq \mathbb{O}H^2$ or $\delta_\Gamma < 0$, then there is a G -equivariant decomposition*

$$L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) = L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{ac} \oplus L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_d ,$$

where the discrete subspace $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_d$, being the closure of the sum of all irreducible subrepresentations of $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$, has a further decomposition

$$L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_d = L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{cusp} \oplus L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_U \oplus L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{res} .$$

$L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{cusp}$ decomposes into discrete series representations of G , each discrete series representation of G occurs with infinite multiplicity. It is zero iff $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, n odd. The remaining part of $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_d$ is zero, if $\delta_\Gamma < 0$.

$L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{ac}$ decomposes into a sum of direct integrals corresponding to the unitary principal series representations of G , each occurring with infinite multiplicity. The corresponding Plancherel measures are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure of $\mathfrak{ia}^*$.

Proof. The only point where Theorem 9.1 goes beyond [21], Theorem 11.1, is that certain contributions of the form $U_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi) \otimes I^{\sigma, \lambda}$ and $E_\Lambda^1(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi) \otimes H^{\sigma, \lambda}$ which appear in [21] do not occur in our definition of $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_U$ and $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{res}$. This is justified by Proposition 4.21 and Proposition 4.23. $\square$

If one does not know that ext_λ is meromorphic in the region $\{\text{Re}(\lambda) > -\varepsilon\}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then it is not possible to determine $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{ac}$ and to show that there is no singular continuous spectrum. However, if one traces back the arguments in [21] and the additional information obtained in Section 4 which led to the determination of $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_d$, one obtains a decomposition of $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_d$ without using ext_λ . In particular, it was indicated in [21], pp. 121-122, how one can prove the finite-dimensionality of ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi))$ without referring to ext_λ . Indeed, also for $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$ and $\delta_\Gamma \geq 0$ the following is true.

Proposition 9.2 *Let $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_d$ be the closure of the sum of all irreducible subrepresentations of $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$. Let $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{U_0} \subset L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_U$ be the orthogonal complement of the contributions of those (σ, λ) such that $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_\sigma)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_d &= L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{cusp} \oplus L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{U_0} \\ &\oplus \text{cl} \left(\bigoplus_{\{\sigma \in \hat{M} \mid p_\sigma(0)=0\}} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in (0, \lambda_\sigma) \cap (0, \delta_\Gamma]} {}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi)) \otimes H^{\sigma, \lambda} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Here cl means the closure in $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$. $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{cusp}$ decomposes into discrete series representations of G , each discrete series representation of G occurs with infinite multiplicity. While for fixed σ the sum over λ might be actually infinite, the individual multiplicity spaces ${}^\Gamma C^{-\infty}(\Lambda, V(\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda, \varphi))$ and $U_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma}_0, \varphi)$ are finite-dimensional.

We now want to compute the L^2 -cohomology groups $H_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$. They are defined as follows

$$H_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) := \frac{\{\omega \in \Omega_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \mid d\omega = 0\}}{\{d\eta \mid \eta \in \Omega_{(2)}^{p-1}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)), d\eta \in \Omega_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))\}}.$$

Here the differential d is taken in the distributional sense. Since φ is unitary the operators δ_F and Δ_F defined in Subsection 7.3 coincide with the operators δ and Δ associated to the Hermitian metric on $E(\pi \otimes \varphi)$ which were introduced in Section 2. We also consider the space of square-integrable harmonic forms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &= \{\omega \in \Omega_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \mid \Delta_F \omega = 0\} \\ &= \{\omega \in \Omega_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \mid d\omega = 0, \delta_F \omega = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality uses the completeness of Y . It follows that the natural map $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \rightarrow H_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is injective. It is an isomorphism if and only if the linear subspace $B_{(2)}^p := \{d\eta \mid \eta \in \Omega_{(2)}^{p-1}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)), d\eta \in \Omega_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))\} \subset \Omega_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is closed. In general, one has an orthogonal decomposition

$$H_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) := \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \oplus \overline{B_{(2)}^p} / B_{(2)}^p, \quad (124)$$

where $\overline{}$ denotes the closure, and the second summand is infinite-dimensional if not zero. $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ considered as a summand of $H_{(2)}^*(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is often called the reduced L^2 -cohomology. For these and more generalities on L^2 -cohomology we refer to [13], Chapter 3. Moreover, we have the following general fact

Lemma 9.3 $\overline{B_{(2)}^p} = B_{(2)}^p$ if and only if $0 \notin \text{spec}(\Delta_F|_{\overline{B_{(2)}^p}})$.

Proof. Assume that $0 \notin \text{spec}(\Delta_F|_{\overline{B_{(2)}^p}})$. This means that $\Delta_F|_{\overline{B_{(2)}^p}} = d\delta_F|_{\overline{B_{(2)}^p}} : \text{dom}(\Delta_F) \cap \overline{B_{(2)}^p} \rightarrow \overline{B_{(2)}^p}$ is surjective. It follows that $\text{im } d = \overline{B_{(2)}^p}$.

Vice versa, if d has closed range, then by general principles $\delta_F = d^*$ has closed range, too. It follows that $\text{im } \delta_F = \ker d^\perp \subset \Omega_{(2)}^{p-1}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$. By assumption any element in $\overline{B_{(2)}^p}$ can be written as $d\eta$ for some η . Here we can assume that $\eta \in \ker d^\perp$. It follows that $d\delta_F$ is surjective on $\overline{B_{(2)}^p}$. By (124) the Laplacian is always injective on $\text{dom}(\Delta_F) \cap \overline{B_{(2)}^p}$. This shows that $0 \notin \text{spec}(\Delta_F|_{\overline{B_{(2)}^p}})$. $\square$

We want to employ the theory of $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -cohomology of irreducible unitarizable $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules in a similar manner as it has been done in the computation of the L^2 -cohomology for symmetric spaces in [9] (compare also [55]) and for locally symmetric spaces of finite volume in [10].

The functor of $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -cohomology $V \mapsto H^*(\mathfrak{g}, K, V)$ which goes from the category of $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules to the category of vector spaces is the right derived functor of the left exact functor taking $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -invariants. $H^*(\mathfrak{g}, K, V)$ can be computed using the standard relative Lie algebra cohomology complex $([V \otimes \Lambda^* \mathfrak{p}^*]^K, d)$, where

$$d\omega(X_0, \dots, X_p) = \sum_{i=0}^p (-1)^i \pi(X_i) \omega(X_0, \dots, \hat{X}_i, \dots, X_p), \quad \omega \in [V \otimes \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}^*]^K, \quad X_i \in \mathfrak{p}.$$

Note that for $V = C^\infty(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_K \otimes F$ this complex is isomorphic to the de Rham complex $\Omega^*(Y, E(\pi \circ \varphi))$. The following basic result can be considered as an algebraic version of Hodge theory.

Proposition 9.4 ([11], II.3.1. and I.5.3.) *Let (π, F) be an irreducible finite-dimensional $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module. Then*

1. *For any irreducible unitarizable $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module (ξ, V)*

$$H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, V \otimes F) = \begin{cases} [V \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}^*]^K & \xi(\Omega) = \pi(\Omega) \\ \{0\} & \xi(\Omega) \neq \pi(\Omega) \end{cases}.$$

2. *If V is a locally $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})$ -finite $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module, then*

$$H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, V \otimes F) = H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, V^{\chi_{\tilde{F}}} \otimes F),$$

where $\tilde{F}$ is the dual representation of F . In particular, if V has (generalized) infinitesimal character $\chi_V \neq \chi_{\tilde{F}}$, then $H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, V \otimes F) = \{0\}$.

We now give the list of the cohomology groups for all irreducible V such that $\chi_V = \chi_{\tilde{F}}$ for some finite-dimensional irreducible F . Note that discrete series modules always have this property. Moreover, iff $X \neq \mathbb{R}H^{2n+1}$, then for any F there are exactly $k_X := |W(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})/W(\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}})|$ inequivalent discrete series modules having infinitesimal character χ_F . Here $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{k}$ which is also a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. We have

X	$\mathbb{R}H^{2n}$	$\mathbb{C}H^n$	$\mathbb{H}H^n$	$\mathbb{O}H^2$
k_X	2	$n+1$	$n+1$	3

In the odd-dimensional case $X \neq \mathbb{R}H^{2n+1}$ there are no discrete series representations.

Proposition 9.5 ([11], II.5.3.) *Let V be a discrete series module with infinitesimal character $\chi_{\tilde{F}}$. Then*

$$H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, V \otimes F) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = \frac{\dim X}{2} \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

By Langlands classification (see e.g. [25], Sect. 2.1) an irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules with infinitesimal character χ_F which is not a discrete series module is equivalent to exactly one of the modules $I_F^w := I^{\sigma, \lambda}$, where

$$w \in W_0 := \{w \in W(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{C}}) \mid w(\mathfrak{h}_+^*) \subset \mathfrak{a}_-^* \oplus \mathfrak{t}_+^*\} \subset W^1$$

and $\sigma_\lambda = \sigma_{F, \lambda_w}^w$. Here we have used the notation of Section 6, and $\mathfrak{a}_-^* := -\mathfrak{a}_+^*$. If $\lambda_w = 0$, which can only happen for $X = \mathbb{R}H^{2n+1}$, then $H^{\sigma_F^w, 0}$ is irreducible, and $I_F^w := H^{\sigma_F^w, 0}$.

If $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, then we have in the notation of Section 6

$$\begin{aligned} W^0 &= \{w_{\frac{n}{2}}, w_{\frac{n}{2}+1}, \dots, w_{n-1}\} & n \text{ even} , \\ W^0 &= \{w_-, w_{\frac{n+1}{2}}, \dots, w_{n-1}\} & n \text{ odd} . \end{aligned}$$

For $p \in \{0, 1, \dots, [\frac{n}{2}] - 1\}$ we set $I_F^p := I_F^{w_{n-1-p}^-}$, $I_F^+ := I_F^{w_-}$. Thus I_F^p , I_F^+ are the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules of the G -representations $\tilde{Z}_F^p$ (introduced before Proposition 8.10) and $C^{-\omega}(\partial X, V(\sigma_{F, \lambda_+}^+))$, respectively.

In the remaining cases the set W^0 can be labeled in a natural way as follows (compare the so-called Hasse diagrams in [25], pp. 177-180)

$$\begin{aligned} \{w_{ij} \mid i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0, i+j \leq n-1\} , & \quad X = \mathbb{C}H^n , \\ \{w_{ij} \mid i \leq j \in \mathbb{N}_0, i+j \leq 2n-1\} , & \quad X = \mathbb{H}H^n , \\ \{w_{00}, \dots, w_{04}, w_{13}, \dots, w_{16}, w_{23}, w_{24}, w_{25}\} , & \quad X = \mathbb{O}H^2 . \end{aligned}$$

Note that w_{ij} has length $\dim \partial X - (i+j)$. We will denote the modules $I_F^{w_{ij}}$ by I_F^{ij} .

Proposition 9.6 *We have for*

$$\begin{aligned} X = \mathbb{R}H^n : \quad H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^q \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = q, n-q \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} , \\ H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^+ \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = \frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{n+1}{2} \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} , \\ X = \mathbb{C}H^n : \quad H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{ij} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = i+j, i+j+2, \dots, 2n-(i+j) \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} , \\ X = \mathbb{H}H^n : \quad H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{ii} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 2i, 2i+4, \dots, 4n-2i \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} , \\ H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{ij} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = i+j, i+j+2, \dots, 4n-(i+j) \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} , \quad i \neq j , \\ X = \mathbb{O}H^2 : \quad H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{00} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 0, 8, 16 \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} , \\ H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{01} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 1, 7, 9, 15 \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} , \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{02} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 2, 6, 8, 10, 14 \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{03} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{04} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 4, 8, 12 \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{13} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 4, 6, 10, 12 \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{14} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 5, 7, 9, 11 \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{15} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 6, 8, 10 \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{16} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 7, 9 \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\
H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^{2j} \otimes F) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & p = 2 + j, 14 - j \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad j = 3, 4, 5.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For the trivial representation $F = \mathbb{C}$ the result is given in [25], Chapter 7. It is not difficult to derive from Proposition 6.1 that $I_{\tilde{F}}^w \cong (I_{\mathbb{C}}^w \otimes \tilde{F})^{\chi_{\tilde{F}}}$. Using Proposition 9.4, 2., we obtain

$$H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\tilde{F}}^w \otimes F) = H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\mathbb{C}}^w \otimes \tilde{F} \otimes F) = H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\mathbb{C}}^w \otimes (\tilde{F} \otimes F)^{\chi_{\mathbb{C}}}) = H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, I_{\mathbb{C}}^w).$$

This finishes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Here we are only interested in the cohomology groups for unitarizable modules. I_F^w is called isolated unitary, if the corresponding representation of G is isolated in the unitary dual, i.e., $\lambda_w > \lambda_{\sigma_F^w}$. Such modules exist for $X = \mathbb{H}H^n$ and $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$, only.

Proposition 9.7 *Among the modules I_F^w precisely the following are unitarizable:*

- $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$: I_F^q for $p_F \leq q$ and I_F^+ for $p_F \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. Here p_F is as in Proposition 7.3. In these cases we have $\lambda_q = \rho - q\alpha$, $\lambda_+ = 0$.
- $X = \mathbb{C}H^n$: I_F^{ij} for those F having highest weight $\nu = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathfrak{h}_+^*$ with $m_i = m_{i+1} = \dots = m_{n-j}$. In this case we have $\lambda_{ij} = (n - (i + j))\alpha$.
- $X = \mathbb{H}H^n$: I_F^{ij} is isolated unitary iff $i = j$ and the highest weight $\nu = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathfrak{h}_+^*$ of F satisfies $m_i = m_{i+1} = \dots = m_n = 0$. Then we have $\lambda_{ii} = (2n + 1 - 2i)\alpha$. The remaining unitarizable modules are I_F^{ij} for $j \geq n$ and $m_i = m_{i+1} = \dots = m_{2n-j}$. In these cases $\lambda_{ij} = (2n - (i + j))\alpha$.

• $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$:

ij	ν	λ_{ij}	<i>isolated</i>
00	$m_0 = \dots = m_3 = 0$	11α	$\times$
04	$m_0 = m_1, m_2 = m_3 = 0$	5α	$\times$
15	$m_0 = m_1 + m_2, m_3 = 0$	2α	
16	$m_0 = m_1 + m_2 + m_3$	α	
23	$m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = 0$	5α	
24	$m_2 = m_3 = 0$	3α	
25	$m_3 = 0$	α	

Here the highest weight of F is given by $\nu = (m_0, m_1, m_2, m_3)$, where $m_i \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, $m_i - m_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $m_0 \geq m_1 + m_2 + m_3$, $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq m_3 \geq 0$.

Proof. The assertion for $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ was already obtained in the proof of Proposition 7.3. For $X = \mathbb{C}H^n$ the module $H^{\sigma, \lambda}$ is irreducible if and only if $\lambda \notin I_{\sigma}^{wr}$ (see Lemma 4.6 and the remark following it). Now (123) implies that I_F^{ij} is unitarizable if and only if $\lambda_{ij} - 2k\alpha \notin I_{\sigma_F^{ij}}^{wr}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lambda_{F, ij} - 2k\alpha \geq 0$. Let $\nu = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathfrak{h}_+^*$ be the highest weight of F . 2α considered as an element of $\mathfrak{h}_+^*$ is given by $(1, 0, \dots, 0, -1)$, $\rho_{\mathfrak{g}} = (\frac{n}{2}, \frac{n-2}{2}, \dots, -\frac{n-2}{2}, -\frac{n}{2})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} -(\lambda_{F, ij} - 2k\alpha) + \mu_{\sigma_F^{ij}} + \rho_{\mathfrak{m}} &= w_{ij}(\nu + \rho_{\mathfrak{g}}) + 2k\alpha \\ &= (m_{n-j} + j + k - \frac{n}{2}, m_0 + \frac{n}{2}, \dots, m_n - \frac{n}{2}, m_i + \frac{n}{2} - i - k). \end{aligned}$$

Such an element is not weakly regular if and only if at least two coordinates coincide. Now the assertion can be easily checked.

The list for $\mathbb{H}H^n$ is extracted from the classification of the unitary dual of $Sp(1, n)$ given in [2], Thm. 7.1. Here we have used that, if $\mathfrak{h}_+^* = \{(m_0, \dots, m_n) \mid m_0 \geq m_1 \geq \dots \geq m_n \geq 0\}$, then $\rho_{\mathfrak{g}} = (n+1, n, \dots, 1)$, $2\alpha = (1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, and

$$w_{ij}(\nu + \rho_{\mathfrak{g}}) = \begin{cases} (-(m_{j+1} + n - j), -(m_i + n + 1 - i), m_0 + n + 1, \dots, m_n + 1) & j \leq n-1 \\ (m_{2n-j} + j + 1 - n, -(m_i + n + 1 - i), m_0 + n + 1, \dots, m_n + 1) & j \geq n \end{cases}.$$

For $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$ and $F = \mathbb{C}$ the list is taken from [25], p. 155, where also the real semisimple part ${}^0\mathfrak{l}_0$ of the Levi subalgebra of the θ -stable parabolic $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is given such that $I_{\mathbb{C}}^{ij} = A_{\mathfrak{q}}(0)$. Here $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(0)$ denotes the Zuckerman module associated to $\mathfrak{q}$ (for this notion see e.g. [67], [68], Chapters 6 and 9). The reader has to be aware that in this list the algebra ${}^0\mathfrak{l}_0 = \mathfrak{sp}(1, 2)$ is missing. Therefore $I_{\mathbb{C}}^{15}$ is unitarizable though stated conversely. Now it follows from the non-vanishing of the cohomology of all modules in question (see Proposition 9.6) and the Vogan-Zuckerman classification of unitarizable modules with cohomology ([67], [68], Thm. 9.7.1) that I_F^{ij} is unitary iff $I_{\mathbb{C}}^{ij}$ is so and the corresponding ${}^0\mathfrak{l}_0$ annihilates the highest weight vector of F . This leads to the conditions on ν . Compare also the list in terms of lowest K -types given in [3]. $\square$

We remark that we could have used the above mentioned Vogan-Zuckerman classification in terms of the modules $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\nu)$ (together with the a priori knowledge that all unitarizable

modules with integral regular infinitesimal character have cohomology [60]) in order to obtain the list of all unitarizable modules I_F^w together with their cohomology at once. For this one has to relate the parametrization by W^0 to the parametrization by θ -stable parabolic subalgebras $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ (modulo certain equivalence relations). A short indication how this rather involved correspondence works can be found in [3], pp. 30-31. However, Theorems 9.6 and 9.7 together contain more information which might be of some value for possible generalizations of Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 6.3 to arbitrary rank one groups.

For each discrete series module $(\xi_{F,i}, V_{\xi_{F,i}})$, $i = 0, \dots, k_X - 1$, with infinitesimal character χ_F we introduce the Hilbert space of multiplicities of the dual module

$$D_{F,i}(\varphi) := \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g},K}(V_{\xi_{F,i}}, L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_K) .$$

It can be identified with a subspace of Γ -invariant elements in the tensor product of the distribution globalization of $V_{\xi_{F,i}}$ with V_{φ} (see [21], Ch. 8). By Theorem 9.1 we have $\dim D_{F,i}(\varphi) = \infty$. As in Subsection 7.1 we consider the non-negative real number d_{Γ} defined by $d_{\Gamma}\alpha := \delta_{\Gamma} + \rho$. Note that d_{Γ} is equal to the Hausdorff dimension of Λ with respect to the natural class of sub-Riemannian metrics on ∂X ([26],[56], [65]). We have (see Corollary 4.22)

X	$\mathbb{R}H^n$	$\mathbb{C}H^n$	$\mathbb{H}H^n$	$\mathbb{O}H^2$
$d_{\Gamma} <$	$n - 1$	$2n$	$4n$	16

(125)

Now we can give a complete description of the L^2 - cohomology groups $H_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ (recall the decomposition (124)).

Theorem 9.8 *Let (π, F) be an irreducible finite-dimensional representation of G , (φ, V_{φ}) a finite-dimensional unitary representation of Γ . We use the same notation for the highest weight of F as in Proposition 9.7.*

If $X \neq \mathbb{O}H^2$ or if $\delta_{\Gamma} < 0$, then $H_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \neq \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ if and only if $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, n odd, $p = \frac{n+1}{2}$, and $p_F \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$ (i.e. $m_{\frac{n-1}{2}} = 0$). In general, we have for

- $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F, \lambda_p}^p, \varphi) , \quad p \leq \frac{n-2}{2} , \\ \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{\frac{n-1}{2}}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{\pm}}^{\pm}, \varphi) , \\ \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{\frac{n}{2}}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong D_{F,0}(\varphi) \oplus D_{F,1}(\varphi) . \end{aligned}$$

If $p < \min\{p_F, n - 1 - d_{\Gamma}\}$, then $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) = \{0\}$.

- $X = \mathbb{C}H^n$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \cong \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\lfloor \frac{p-1}{2} \rfloor} \bigoplus_{i+j=p-2l} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) , \quad p \leq n-1 ,$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^n(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \cong \bigoplus_{i=0}^n D_{F,i}(\varphi) \oplus \bigoplus_{l=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} \bigoplus_{i+j=n-2l} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) .$$

If $m_i > m_{n-j}$ or $i + j < 2n - d_{\Gamma}$, then $U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) = \{0\}$.

- $X = \mathbb{H}H^n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\lfloor \frac{p-n}{2} \rfloor} \bigoplus_{i+j=p-2l, j \geq n} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) , \quad p \leq 2n-1, \quad p \text{ odd} , \\ \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong \bigoplus_{i=3,5,\dots,\frac{p}{2}} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ii}}^{ii}, \varphi) \oplus \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\lfloor \frac{p-n}{2} \rfloor} \bigoplus_{i+j=p-2l, j \geq n} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) , \\ &\quad p \leq 2n-1, \quad p \equiv 2 \pmod{4} , \\ \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong \bigoplus_{i=2,4,\dots,\frac{p}{2}} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ii}}^{ii}, \varphi) \oplus \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\lfloor \frac{p-n}{2} \rfloor} \bigoplus_{i+j=p-2l, j \geq n} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) , \\ &\quad p \leq 2n-1, \quad p \equiv 0 \pmod{4} , \\ \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{2n}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong \bigoplus_{i=0}^n D_{F,i}(\varphi) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=3,5,\dots,n} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ii}}^{ii}, \varphi) \\ &\quad \oplus \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\lfloor \frac{p-n}{2} \rfloor} \bigoplus_{i+j=p-2l, j \geq n} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) , \quad n \text{ odd} , \\ \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{2n}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong \bigoplus_{i=0}^n D_{F,i}(\varphi) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=2,4,\dots,n} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ii}}^{ii}, \varphi) \\ &\quad \oplus \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\lfloor \frac{p-n}{2} \rfloor} \bigoplus_{i+j=p-2l, j \geq n} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) , \quad n \text{ even} . \end{aligned}$$

If $m_i \neq 0$ or $2i < 4n + 2 - d_{\Gamma}$, then $U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ii}}^{ii}, \varphi) = \{0\}$. If $m_i > m_{2n-j}$ or $i + j < 4n + 1 - d_{\Gamma}$, then $U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) = \{0\}$.

- $X = \mathbb{O}H^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &= \{0\} , \quad p \leq 5 , \\ \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^6(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{15}}^{15}, \varphi) \oplus U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{24}}^{24}, \varphi) , \\ \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^7(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{16}}^{16}, \varphi) \oplus U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{25}}^{25}, \varphi) , \\ \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^8(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) &\cong D_{F,0}(\varphi) \oplus D_{F,1}(\varphi) \oplus D_{F,2}(\varphi) \oplus U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{15}}^{15}, \varphi) . \end{aligned}$$

We have $U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{ij}}^{ij}, \varphi) = \{0\}$, if $\lambda_{ij} > \delta_{\Gamma}$ or if the highest weight $\nu = (m_0, m_1, m_2, m_3)$ of F does not satisfy the condition given by the table in Proposition 9.7.

By Poincaré duality $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{\dim Y - p}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \cong \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$. For $p \neq \frac{\dim Y}{2}$ the spaces $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ are finite-dimensional. In case of even dimension $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{\frac{\dim Y}{2}}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ is always infinite-dimensional.

Proof. We employ the isomorphism (122) which sends Δ_F to $-\Omega \otimes \text{id} \otimes \text{id} + \text{id} \otimes \pi(\Omega) \otimes \text{id}$.

Lemma 9.3 and the decomposition (124) tell us that $\overline{B_{(2)}^p} \neq B_{(2)}^p$ if and only if 0 belongs to the continuous spectrum of Δ_F restricted to p -cocycles. By Theorem 9.1 this can only occur if

$$0 \in \{\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}(\Omega) - \pi(\Omega) \mid \lambda \in i\mathfrak{a}^*, \sigma \in \hat{M} \text{ s.t. } [H^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}^*]^K \neq \{0\}\}.$$

If $(\sigma, \lambda) \in \hat{M} \times i\mathfrak{a}^*$ satisfies $\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}(\Omega) - \pi(\Omega) = 0$, then Proposition 9.4 implies that

$$[H^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}^*]^K = H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, H^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes F) \quad (126)$$

and that $\chi_{\sigma, \lambda} = \chi_{\bar{F}}$. By Propositions 9.6 and 9.7 the space $H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, H^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes F)$ is non-zero if and only if $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, n odd, $p = \frac{n+1}{2}$, $p_{\bar{F}} \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$, $\lambda = 0$, and $\sigma = \sigma_{\bar{F}}^{\pm}$. Note that $p_{\bar{F}} = p_F$. Fix such a σ . It remains to check for which $p \in \{\frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{n+1}{2}\}$ the corresponding direct integral over $i\mathfrak{a}^*$ contributes to cocycles in $\Omega_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$. This happens iff the space of p -cocycles in the relative Lie algebra cohomology complex $([H^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}^*]^K, d)$ is non-zero for a nonempty open subset of $i\mathfrak{a}^*$. The left hand side of (126) does not depend on λ . It follows that $[H^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}^*]^K = \{0\}$ for $p \notin \{\frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{n+1}{2}\}$ and all λ . Since for $\lambda \neq 0$ the cohomology $H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, H^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes F)$ vanishes for all p we conclude that d is injective on $[H^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \mathfrak{p}^*]^K$ and that $[H^{\sigma, \lambda} \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \mathfrak{p}^*]^K$ consists entirely of cocycles. This proves the first assertion of the theorem.

Let $\hat{G}$ be the unitary dual of G . If we write

$$L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_d = \bigoplus_{\xi \in \hat{G}}^{\text{Hilbert}} \text{Hom}_G(W_{\xi}, L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)) \hat{\otimes} W_{\xi},$$

then

$$\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) = \bigoplus_{\{\xi \in \hat{G} \mid \xi(\Omega) = \pi(\Omega)\}}^{\text{Hilbert}} \text{Hom}_G(W_{\xi}, L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)) \otimes [W_{\xi, K} \otimes F \otimes \Lambda^p \mathfrak{p}^*]^K.$$

Here $W_{\xi, K}$ denotes the underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -module of W_{ξ} . By Proposition 9.4 the right hand side is equal to the finite sum

$$\bigoplus_{\{\xi \in \hat{G} \mid \chi_{\xi} = \chi_{\bar{F}}\}} \text{Hom}_G(W_{\xi}, L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)) \otimes H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, W_{\xi, K} \otimes F).$$

If W_{ξ} is a discrete series representation with $\chi_{\xi} = \chi_{\bar{F}}$, then $\text{Hom}_G(W_{\xi}, L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)) = D_{F, i}(\varphi)$ for some $i \in \{0, \dots, k_X - 1\}$. The underlying $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ -modules of the remaining unitary representations with $\chi_{\xi} = \chi_{\bar{F}}$ are listed in Proposition 9.7. Theorem 9.1 and Proposition 9.2 then assert that $\dim D_{F, i}(\varphi) = \infty$ and that for the remaining representations $\text{Hom}_G(W_{\xi}, L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi))$

is one of the finite-dimensional spaces $U_\Lambda(\sigma_{F,\lambda_w}^w, \varphi)$, $w \in W^0$. Note that $\widetilde{\sigma_F^w} = \sigma_F^w$ unless $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$, n odd, $w = w_-$. The restrictions for the possible values of d_Γ indicated in table (125) force some of these multiplicity spaces to be zero. The cohomology groups $H^p(\mathfrak{g}, K, W_{\xi,K} \otimes F)$ have been determined in Propositions 9.5 and 9.6. This finishes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

We would like to emphasize the following two vanishing results which are contained in Theorem 9.8.

Corollary 9.9 *Define the critical strip S_X by the following table:*

X	S_X
$\mathbb{R}H^n$	$[n - 1 - d_\Gamma, d_\Gamma + 1]$
$\mathbb{C}H^n$	$[2n - d_\Gamma, d_\Gamma]$
$\mathbb{H}H^n$	$[2 + (4n - d_\Gamma), d_\Gamma - 2] \cap 2\mathbb{Z} \cup [1 + (4n - d_\Gamma), d_\Gamma - 1] \cap [n, 3n]$
$\mathbb{O}H^2$	$[6, 10] \cap [19 - d_\Gamma, d_\Gamma - 3]$

If $p \notin S_X$ and $p \neq \frac{\dim Y}{2}$, then $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) = \{0\}$.

Corollary 9.10 *If F is generic, i.e., its highest weight ν lies in the interior of the positive Weyl chamber $\mathfrak{h}_+^*$, then $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) = \{0\}$ for $p \neq \frac{\dim Y}{2}$.*

We also conclude

Corollary 9.11 *If $X = \mathbb{R}H^n$ and $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$, then the natural map*

$$\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$$

is an isomorphism. For $p = \frac{n}{2}$ it is surjective.

Proof. Let $p \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$. By Theorem 6.3 and Theorem 9.8 both sides are isomorphic to $U_\Lambda(\sigma_{F,\lambda_{n-p}}^{n-p}, \varphi)$ (or to $U_\Lambda(\sigma_{F,0}^\pm, \varphi)$, respectively). We leave the simple verification that these isomorphisms are compatible with the map $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) \rightarrow H^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ to the reader. Similarly, for $p = \frac{n}{2}$ we use the fact that $Z_{F,\Lambda}^{\frac{n}{2}}(\varphi) \subset D_{F,0}(\varphi) \oplus D_{F,1}(\varphi)$ (compare the proof of Lemma 6.6). $\square$

It was asked in the introduction of [21] what the significance of the space $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_U$, that is of the multiplicity spaces $U_\Lambda(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$, could be. For regular infinitesimal character $\chi_{\sigma,\lambda}$ Theorem 9.8 provides an answer. The spaces $U_\Lambda(\sigma_\lambda, \varphi)$ appear as a kind of primitive parts

of the L^2 -cohomology spaces $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^p(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$, $\chi_{\sigma, \lambda} = \chi_F$. Indeed, for $X = \mathbb{C}H^n$ it is not difficult to verify that

$$\mathcal{H}_{0,(2)}^{p,q}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi)) = \begin{cases} U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{F, \lambda_{qp}}^{qp}, \varphi) & p+q \leq n-1 \\ D_{F,q} & p = n-q \end{cases},$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{0,(2)}^{p,q}(Y, E(\pi \otimes \varphi))$ denotes the space of square integrable harmonic primitive (p, q) -forms. (It would be interesting to find an analogous interpretation of the spaces $U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)$ for weakly regular, singular infinitesimal character $\chi_{\sigma, \lambda}$.) We see that the spaces $U_{\Lambda}(\sigma_{\lambda}, \varphi)$ play a similar role as the multiplicity spaces of the discrete series. This phenomenon can also be observed from a pure harmonic analysis point of view. Let $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) \subset L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$ be the Schwartz space (see [21], Ch. 8) which is the analog for $\Gamma \backslash G$ of the Harish-Chandra Schwartz space of G . Its subspace

$${}^0\mathcal{C}(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) = \{f \in \mathcal{C}(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi) \mid \int_N f(gnh) dn = 0 \text{ for all } g, h \in G \text{ s.t. } gP \in \Omega\}$$

may be considered as the analog of the Harish-Chandra space of cusp forms on G . The closure of ${}^0\mathcal{C}(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$ in $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)$ can be shown to be equal to

$$L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_{\text{cusp}} \oplus L^2(\Gamma \backslash G, \varphi)_U.$$

References

- [1] N. Aronszajn, A. Krzywicki, and J. Szarski. A unique continuation theorem for exterior differential forms on Riemannian manifolds. *Ark. Mat.* 4 (1962), 417–453.
- [2] M. W. Baldoni Silva. The unitary dual of $Sp(n, 1)$, $n \geq 2$. *Duke Math. J.* 48 (1981), 549–583.
- [3] M. W. Baldoni Silva and D. Barbasch. The unitary spectrum for real rank one groups. *Invent. math.* 72 (1983), 27–55.
- [4] M. W. Baldoni Silva and H. Kraljević. Composition factors of the principal series representations of the group $Sp(n, 1)$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 262 (1980), 447–471.
- [5] R. J. Baston and M. G. Eastwood. *The Penrose Transform*. Oxford University Press, 1989.
- [6] J. Bernstein and A. Reznikov. Sobolev norms of automorphic functionals and Fourier coefficients of cusp forms. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 327 (1998), 111–116.
- [7] A. Borel. Stable and L^2 -cohomology of arithmetic groups. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 3 (1980), 1025–1027.
- [8] A. Borel. Regularization theorems in Lie algebra cohomology. Applications. *Duke math. J.* 50 (1983), 606–623.
- [9] A. Borel. The L^2 -cohomology of negatively curved Riemannian symmetric spaces. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.* 10 (1985), 95–105.
- [10] A. Borel and W. Casselman. L^2 -cohomology of locally symmetric manifolds of finite volume. *Duke Math. J.* 50 (1983), 625–647.
- [11] A. Borel and N. Wallach. *Continuous Cohomology, Discrete Subgroups, and Representations of Reductive Groups*. Princeton University Press, 1980.
- [12] R. W. Bruggeman. Automorphic forms, hyperfunction cohomology, and period functions. *J. reine angew. Math.* 492 (1997), 1–39.
- [13] J.-L. Brylinski and S. Zucker. An overview of recent advances in Hodge theory. In *Encyclopedia of Math. Sciences, Vol. 69; Several Complex Variables VI*, pages 39–142. Springer, 1990.
- [14] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Gamma-cohomology and the Selberg zeta function. *J. reine angew. Math.* 467 (1995), 199–219.
- [15] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. *Selberg Zeta and Theta Functions*. Akademie Verlag, 1995.
- [16] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Cohomological properties of the canonical globalizations of Harish-Chandra modules. *Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom.* 15 (1997), 401–418.
- [17] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Fuchsian groups of the second kind and representations carried by the limit set. *Inv. Math.* 127 (1997), 127–154.

- [18] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Resolutions of distribution globalizations of Harish-Chandra modules and cohomology. *J. reine angew. Math.* 497 (1998), 47–81.
- [19] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Group cohomology and the singularities of the Selberg zeta function associated to a Kleinian group. *Ann. of Math.* 149 (1999), 627–689.
- [20] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Scattering theory for geometrically finite groups. Preprint arXiv:math.DG/9904137, also available at <http://www.uni-math.gwdg.de/olbrich>, 1999.
- [21] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. The spectrum of Kleinian manifolds. *J. Funct. Anal.* 172 (2000), 76–164.
- [22] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Towards the trace formula for convex-cocompact groups. Preprint arXiv:math.DG/0003053, also available at <http://www.uni-math.gwdg.de/olbrich>, 2000.
- [23] U. Bunke and M. Olbrich. Regularity of invariant distributions. Preprint arXiv:math.DG/0103144, also available at <http://www.uni-math.gwdg.de/olbrich>, 2001.
- [24] W. Casselman. Automorphic forms and a Hodge theory for congruence subgroups of $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$. In *Lie Group Representations II*, pages 103–140. Lect. Notes Math. 1041, Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [25] D. H. Collingwood. *Representations of Rank One Lie Groups*. Pitman, Boston, Research Notes in Math. 137, 1985.
- [26] K. Corlette. Hausdorff dimensions of limit sets. *Invent. math.* 102 (1990), 521–542.
- [27] F. Delacroix. Invariant currents and automorphic forms of an elementary Kleinian group. To appear in *Hokkaido Math. Journal*.
- [28] J. Franke. Harmonic analysis in weighted L_2 -spaces. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* 31 (1998), 181–279.
- [29] D. Fried. The zeta functions of Ruelle and Selberg I. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* 19 (1986), 491–517.
- [30] P.-Y. Gaillard. Transformation de Poisson de formes différentielles. Le case de l’ espace hyperbolique. *Comment. Math. Helv.* 61 (1986), 581–616.
- [31] P.-Y. Gaillard. A Hodge theorem for noncompact manifolds. Available at math.DG/0003029, see also Subsection 1.1 of *A Mathematical Hypertext* at www.iecn.u-nancy.fr/~gaillard/R/r.html, 2000.
- [32] P.-Y. Gaillard. Around the Harder-Borel conjecture. Section 2 of *A Mathematical Hypertext* available at www.iecn.u-nancy.fr/~gaillard/E/e.html, 2001.
- [33] I. C. Gohberg and M. G. Krein. *Introduction to the Theory of Linear Nonselfadjoint Operators*. AMS, Providence, 1969.

- [34] G. Harder. On the cohomology of discrete arithmetically defined groups. In *Discrete Subgroups of Lie Groups and Applications to Moduli*, pages 129–160. Oxford University Press, 1975.
- [35] H. Hecht and W. Schmid. On the asymptotics of Harish-Chandra modules. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 343 (1983), 169–183.
- [36] S. Helgason. *Geometric Analysis on Symmetric Spaces*. Math. Surveys 39, A.M.S. Providence, R. I., 1994.
- [37] L. Hörmander. *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York Tokyo, 1983.
- [38] H. Izeki. Limit sets of Kleinian groups and conformally flat Riemannian manifolds. *Inv. math.* 122 (1995), 603–625.
- [39] A. Juhl. On the Poisson transformation for differential forms on hyperbolic spaces. In *Seminar Analysis of the Karl-Weierstraß-Institut 1986/87*, pages 224–236. PSB Teubner Leipzig, Teubner-Texte zur Math. 106, 1988.
- [40] A. Juhl. *Cohomological Theory of Dynamical Zeta Functions*. Birkhäuser, 2001.
- [41] M. Kashiwara, T. Kawai, and T. Kimura. *Foundations of Algebraic Analysis*. Princeton Univ. Press, 1986.
- [42] M. Kashiwara and W. Schmid. Quasi-equivariant $\mathcal{D}$ -modules, equivariant derived category, and representations of reductive Lie groups. In *Lie Theory and Geometry. In Honor of Bertram Kostant*, pages 457–488. Progr. in Math. 123, Birkhäuser Boston, 1994.
- [43] C. E. Kenig. Carleman estimates, uniform sobolev inequalities for second order differential operators, and unique continuation theorems. In *Proc. of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Berkeley 1986)*, pages 948–960. AMS, Providence, 1987.
- [44] A. W. Knap. *Representation Theory of Semisimple Lie Groups. An Overview Based on Examples*. Princeton University Press, 1986.
- [45] A. W. Knap and E. M. Stein. Intertwining operators for semisimple Lie groups. *Ann. Math.* 93 (1971), 489–578.
- [46] B. Kostant. On the existence and irreducibility of certain series of representations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 75 (1969), 627–642.
- [47] J. Lewis and D. Zagier. Period functions for Maass wave forms. *Ann. of Math.*, 153 (2001), 191–258.
- [48] J. Lott. Invariant currents on limit sets. *Comment. Math. Helv.* 75 (2000), 319–350.
- [49] B. Malgrange. Existence et approximation des solutions des équations aux dérivées partielles et des équations de convolution. *Ann. Inst. Fourier* 6 (1955-56), 271–354.
- [50] R. Mazzeo and R. Phillips. Hodge theory on hyperbolic manifolds. *Duke Math. J.* 60 (1990), 509–559.

- [51] R. Miatello and N. R. Wallach. Automorphic forms constructed from Whittaker vectors. *J. Funct. Anal.* 86 (1989), 411–487.
- [52] S. Nayatani. Patterson-Sullivan measure and conformally flat metrics. *Math. Zeitschrift* 225 (1997), 115–131.
- [53] M. Olbrich. *Die Poisson-Transformation für homogene Vektorbündel.* PhD thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 1995 (also available at <http://www.uni-math.gwdg.de/olbrich>).
- [54] M. Olbrich. Hodge theory on hyperbolic manifolds of infinite volume. In *Lie theory and its applications in physics III*, pages 75–83. World Scientific, 2000.
- [55] M. Olbrich. L^2 -invariants of locally symmetric spaces. Preprint arXiv:math.DG/0009039, also available at <http://www.uni-math.gwdg.de/olbrich>, 2000.
- [56] S. J. Patterson. The limit set of a Fuchsian group. *Acta Math.* 136 (1976), 241–273.
- [57] S. J. Patterson. Two conjectures on Kleinian groups. Talk at Warwick, March, 1993.
- [58] S. J. Patterson and P. A. Perry. The divisor of Selberg’s zeta function for Kleinian groups. *Duke Math. J.*, 106 (2001), 321–390.
- [59] J. G. Ratcliffe. *Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds.* Springer, 1994.
- [60] S. A. Salamanca-Riba. On the unitary dual of real reductive Lie groups and the $A_q(\lambda)$ modules: the strongly regular case. *Duke Math. J.* 96 (1999), 521–546.
- [61] W. Schmid. Boundary value problems for group invariant differential equations. *Soc. Math. de France, Asterisque, hors série*, pages 311–321, 1985.
- [62] W. Schmid. Automorphic distributions for $Sl(2, \mathbb{R})$. In *Conférence Moshé Flato 1999, Quantization, Deformations and Symmetries, volume 1*, pages 345–387. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.
- [63] J. Schwermer. Cohomology of arithmetic groups, automorphic forms and L -functions. In *Cohomology of arithmetic groups and automorphic forms*. Lect. Notes in Math. 1447, Springer, 1990.
- [64] B. Speh and D. A. Vogan. Reducibility of generalized principal series representations. *Acta Math.* 145 (1980), 227–299.
- [65] D. Sullivan. The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions. *I.H.E.S. Publ. Math.*, 50 (1979), 171–209.
- [66] H. van der Ven. Vector valued Poisson transforms on Riemannian symmetric spaces of rank one. *J. Funct. Anal.* 119 (1994), 358–400.
- [67] D. A. Vogan and G. J. Zuckerman. Unitary representations with nonzero cohomology. *Compositio Math.* 53 (1984), 51–90.
- [68] N. R. Wallach. *Real Reductive Groups.* Academic Press, 1988.

- [69] N. R. Wallach. *Real Reductive Groups II*. Academic Press, 1992.
- [70] R. O. Wells. *Differential Analysis on Complex Manifolds*. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1973.
- [71] D. P. Zelobenko. Operators of discrete symmetry for reductive Lie groups (in russ.). *Izvestija AN SSSR, Ser. matem.*, 40 (1976), 1055–1083.